

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o LXXXVI. JANUARY 1897.

ART. I.—THE PAPAL ENCYCLICAL ON UNITY.

1. *Sanctissimi Domini nostri Leonis Divina Providentia Papæ XIII. Epistola Encyclica ad Patriarchas, Primates, Archiepiscopos, Episcopos, aliosque locorum ordinarios pacem et communionem cum Apostolica Sede habentes. De Unitate Ecclesiæ.* (Romæ, 1896.)
2. *Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. on the Unity of the Church.* Authorised Translation. (London, 1896.)

THE interest in the Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. on the Unity of the Church has been to a certain extent lessened by the publication of the Bull *Apostolicæ curæ* on the subject of Anglican Orders. It is natural that this should be the case. The Bull has made the attitude of the Papacy on the nature of the English Church so clear that English Churchmen who are deeply convinced in intellect and in conscience that they are not only baptized Christians, but also receive in the Sacrament of the Altar the true Body and Blood of Christ and plead in the same Sacrament the true Christian Sacrifice, may well be forgiven if for the moment they are inclined to say that it is no longer a matter of any concern to them what may be asserted or denied by the Bishop of Rome. That the Bull should greatly reduce the influence which any words of the Pope might have on English thought is only what those who recognize how utterly it fails to allow for known facts of history would readily expect. Yet we venture to recall to the minds of our readers the Encyclical Letter on Unity. And we do so for reasons which, in our judgment, are of very high importance. The desirability of external unity is not at an end because the great Bishop who might have done much to promote it has struck a rude blow. English Churchmen who

VOL. XLIII.—NO. LXXXVI.

U

realize their responsibilities will continue to pray, as they and their forefathers have prayed, that the wounds of centuries may in God's good time be healed. They will continue to hold as a practical law of thought and life that only beliefs and maxims which will bear to be looked at in the light of future reunion can be true and right. And, mindful of this, they will need to take pains to preserve in the greatest clearness true ideas of what the unity of the Church really is and demands. The Encyclical Letter *Satis cognitum* involves wider issues even than the present relation of the Church of England to the See of Rome. Written apparently with the position of the Eastern Bishops at least as much in view as that of those of our own communion, it is a statement of the most formal and definite character of the Papal doctrine of unity. It needs to be considered by English Churchmen, then, both that they may use an opportunity of clearing their minds as to what they mean by unity and that they may have more accurate knowledge of the Roman doctrine on the subject, and of the methods and arguments by which it is supported.

We are writing in loyalty to what we believe to be the true standpoint of the Church of England. Three centuries ago the Church in the West passed through a period of storm and conflict. In the stress of the struggle there were actions and words on all sides which had better been left undone, unspoken, unwritten—words and actions such as no time of transition and of battle has been without. Tremendous problems had to be faced. New lines of thought of most varying kinds on most differing subjects were in view. Throughout great part of Europe there were movements of mind and heart which were difficult to estimate. The See of Rome, whose high office it might have been to guide and strengthen, failed to realize what the task presented to it was. Upon its Bishops in that trying time lies the condemnation which falls upon men who do not grasp the opportunities of life. When the central Bishopric of the West, the chief See of the whole Church, had by moral faults made itself incompetent to deal with the issues of the day, it was no wonder that the minds of men everywhere were confused and perplexed. In England there was no freedom from the confusion and perplexity which prevailed elsewhere. The calm voice of history passes its judgment on grave faults, on terror here and self-seeking there, on abandonment of principle in one and rigid adherence to what was untrue or unimportant in another, on the failures of individuals tried beyond their insight or their strength. He is no friend to truth who

atte
cen
hea
tha
But
and
of I
God
brea
first
met
trin
at s
aba
of t
tha
littl
aga

of u
Fat
whi
reta

som
rep
our

shou
as th
to w

and
and

'to
Cyp
of w
from
nec
that
men

1
decr
corp
haer
3

attempts to depict in fancy colours the events of the sixteenth century in England or anywhere else where the great upheavals of thought reached. It was with no unstained record that the Church of England came through the days of trial. But there were two principles which, under whatever pressure and at whatever inducements, she never let go—the principle of Holy Scripture as a final authority ordained by Almighty God in theological and moral truth, and the principle that to break with the historical Church must be wrong. It was the first principle which underlay much in her reconstruction of methods of worship and all that she attempted to do in doctrinal teaching: it was the second principle which made her, at some emergencies, imperil her own existence rather than abandon the historic government and Apostolical constitution of the Church. And any who should think it a light thing that these two principles were preserved can have studied to little purpose the controversy with Rome and the struggles against the Anabaptist and other sectaries.

When, therefore, we endeavour to examine the question of unity in the light of Holy Scripture and any 'consent of Fathers' which can be found, we are acting upon principles which, with great definiteness, the Church of England has retained as her own.

It is from this standpoint that we are able to welcome some parts of the Encyclical. The unity of the Church is represented as having its centre in the Head of the Church, our Lord Jesus Christ.

'The Son of God,' says the Pope, 'decreed that the Church should be His mystical body, with which He should be united as the Head, after the manner of the human body which He assumed, to which the natural head is physiologically united' (p. xiv);¹

and he goes on, with reference to the teaching of St. Cyprian and St. Augustine, to point out that

'to set forth more clearly the unity of the Church, he' (*i.e.* St. Cyprian) 'makes use of the illustration of a living body, the members of which cannot possibly live unless united to the head and drawing from it their vital force. Separated from the head they must of necessity die. . . . Another head like to Christ must be invented—that is, another Christ—if besides the one Church, which is His body, men wish to set up another' (pp. xv-xvi).²

¹ 'Illud accedit, quod Ecclesiam Filius Dei mysticum corpus suum decrevit fore, quocum ipse velut caput conjungeretur, ad similitudinem corporis humani quod suscepit: cui quidem naturali conglutinatione inhaeret naturale caput' (p. 12).

² 'Quo melius Ecclesiam effingat unicam, similitudinem animati

There is no need for us to spend time in showing that it is both Scriptural and Patristic to say that the members of the Church must be in such unity with one another as enables them to remain in union with Christ the Church's Head.¹

Similarly welcome, from our standpoint, is the assertion that the necessary methods both of the unity and of the government of the Church must be sought in the teaching of Christ.

'In judging and determining the nature of this unity many have erred in various ways. Not the foundation of the Church alone, but its whole constitution, belongs to the class of things effected by Christ's free choice. For this reason the entire case must be judged by what was actually done. We must consequently investigate not how the Church may possibly be one, but how He, who founded it, willed that it should be one' (p. xi).²

'It is of the greatest importance, and indeed of absolute necessity, as to which many are deceived, that the nature and character of this unity' (*i.e.* of faith) 'should be recognized. And, as we have already stated, this is not to be ascertained by conjecture, but by the certain knowledge of what was done : that is, by seeking for and ascertaining what kind of unity in faith has been commanded by Jesus Christ' (p. xviii).³

'The nature of this supreme authority, which all Christians are bound to obey, can be ascertained only by finding out what was the evident and positive will of Christ' (p. xxxv).⁴

It is a matter of entire satisfaction to us to find it thus clearly

corporis informat, cujus non aliter victura membra sunt, nisi colligata cum capite, vim ad se vitalem ex capite ipso traducant : sejuncta, necesse est emori. . . . Aliud igitur simile Christo incohetur caput, alius Christus, si præter eam, quæ corpus ejus est, fingi Ecclesiam alteram liceat' (pp. 13-14).

¹ The passages quoted in the Encyclical are 1 Cor. xii. 12 ; Eph. i. 22-23, iv. 15-16, v. 29-30 ; St. Cyp. *De Cath. Eccl. Unit.* 6, 23 ; St. Aug. *Sermo* cclxvii. 4.

² 'Verum in dijudicanda statuendaque natura unitatis, multos varius error de via deflectit. Ecclesiæ quidem non solum ortus sed tota constitutio ad rerum voluntate libera effectarum pertinet genus : quocirca ad id quod revera gestum est, judicatio est omnis revocanda, exquirendumque non sane quo pacto una esse Ecclesia queat, sed quo unam esse is voluit, qui condidit' (p. 9).

³ 'Illud potius maximi momenti ac prorsus necessarium, in quo multi errore falluntur, internoscere quæ sit istius species et forma unitatis. Quod ipsum, ut supra fecimus in caussa simili, non opinione aut conjectura est, sed scientia rei gestæ judicandum : quærendo scilicet statuendoque qualem in fide unitatem Jesus Christus esse præcepit' (p. 16).

⁴ Quæ vero et cujusmodi summa ista potestas sit, cui christianos parere oportet universos, non aliter nisi comperta cognitaque voluntate Christi statuendum' (p. 32).

asserted
authori-

We
the dis
'object
At the
unity w

'Th
those wh
Lord—l
(p. xvi)

and the

'But
that is,
united b
one bod
dation o
of wills

There
distinct
more f
'unity
received
matter
stating
as a new
gave it

And
Bishops
possessi

'If t
supreme,
made Pe

'Es
eant, abe
salutis iti

'At
ejusmodi,
tenterent
efficerent.
necessari
quo consp
(pp. 14-1

The
part asser
'is idem

asserted that the plausibility of *a priori* theories of unity and authority is not to be regarded as giving them weight.

We welcome also, though less fully, a tendency towards the distinction, well known in Anglican theology, between 'objective' or 'organic' and 'subjective' or 'moral' unity. At the end of the paragraph declaring the necessity of the unity which makes union with Christ possible it is said :

'The Church of Christ, therefore, is one and the same for ever : those who leave it depart from the will and command of Christ, the Lord—leaving the path of salvation they enter on that of perdition' (p. xvi) ;¹

and the next paragraph begins :

'But He, indeed, who made this one Church, also gave it *unity*, that is, He made it such that all who are to belong to it must be united by the closest bonds, so as to form one society, one kingdom, one body. . . . Agreement and union of minds is the necessary foundation of this perfect concord amongst men, from which concurrence of wills and similarity of action are the natural result' (p. xvii).²

There is a tendency here, as we have said, towards the distinction we have mentioned. We could wish it had been more fully and clearly expressed, and that the position of 'unity of faith' in relation to the two kinds of unity had received a different treatment³ ; but, while this is so, it is a matter of no small importance to find the Pope expressly stating 'the Church of Christ . . . is one' (p. xvi) and then, as a new point, 'He, indeed, who made this one Church, also gave it *unity*' (p. xvii).

And, again, we are able to welcome the statement that Bishops are not to be regarded as 'vicars' of the Pope but as possessing inherent authority of their own :

'If the authority of Peter and his successors is plenary and supreme, it is not to be regarded as the sole authority. For He who made Peter the foundation of the Church also "chose twelve, whom

¹ 'Est igitur Ecclesia Christi unica et perpetua : quicumque seorsum eant, aberrant a voluntate et præscriptione Christi Domini, relictoque salutis itinere, ad interitum digrediuntur' (p. 14).

² 'At vero qui unicam condidit, is idem condidit *unam* : videlicet ejusmodi, ut quotquot in ipsa futuri essent, arctissimis vinculis sociati tenerentur, ita prorsus ut unam gentem, unum regnum, corpus unum efficerent. . . . Tantæ autem inter homines ac tam absolutæ concordie necessarium fundamentum est convenientia conjunctioque mentium : ex quo conspiratio voluntatum atque agendorum similitudo natura gignitur' (pp. 14-15).

³ The unity of faith is considered after the Pope has passed from the part asserting that 'est . . . Ecclesia Christi unica' to the part beginning 'is idem condidit *unam*.'

He called Apostles" (Luke vi. 13); and just as it is necessary that the authority of Peter should be perpetuated in the Roman Pontiff, so, by the fact that the Bishops succeed the Apostles, they inherit their ordinary power, and thus the Episcopal order necessarily belongs to the essential constitution of the Church. Although they do not receive plenary, or universal, or supreme authority, they are not to be looked upon as *vicars* of the Roman Pontiffs, because they exercise a power really their own, and are most truly called the *ordinary* pastors of the peoples over whom they rule' (p. xlvii).¹

However the practical methods of the Roman Church may lessen the value of an abstract statement of this kind, it is still satisfactory that the statement itself should have been thus clearly made.

And, on a different subject, the repudiation of the idea that 'the Church has any wish to interfere in civil matters, or to infringe upon the rights of the State' (p. xxxiii)² may be noted as marking a policy strikingly different from that which has sometimes characterized the Roman See.

One of the points in the Encyclical which we have thus welcomed is the assertion that the method of necessary unity is to be sought in the teaching of Christ. It is when we come to the question what the teaching of Christ is on this subject that we are obliged to dissent. In the Pope's view, the unity of the Church demands a supreme authority, and a supreme authority necessitates an earthly head.

'Since He willed that His kingdom should be visible, He was obliged, when He ascended into Heaven, to designate a vice-gerent on earth' (p. xxxv).³

'Jesus Christ, therefore, appointed Peter to be the head of the Church: and He also determined that the authority instituted in

¹ 'Si Petri ejusque successorum plena ac summa potestas est, ea tamen esse ne putetur sola. Nam qui Petrum Ecclesiæ fundamentum posuit, idem "elegit duodecim . . . quos et apostolos nominavit" (Luc. vi. 13). Quo modo Petri auctoritatem in romano Pontifice perpetuam permanere necesse est, sic Episcopi, quod succedunt Apostolis, horum potestatem ordinariam hereditate capiunt; ita ut intimam Ecclesiæ constitutionem ordo episcoporum necessario attingit. Quamquam vero neque plenam neque universalem ii, neque summam obtinent auctoritatem, non tamen *vicarii* romanorum Pontificum putandi, quia potestatem gerunt sibi propriam, verissimeque populorum, quos regunt, antistites *ordinarii* dicuntur' (pp. 44-5).

² 'Quocirca Ecclesiam aut non recte norunt aut inique criminantur qui eam insimulant, velle se in civitatum rationes inferre, aut in jura potentatus invadere' (p. 30).

³ 'Certe in æternum rex Christus est, itemque moderari in æternum tuerique regnum suum e cælo non visus perseverat: sed quia conspicuum illud esse voluit, designare debuit qui gereret in terris vices suas, postea quam ipse ad cælestia rediisset' (pp. 32-3).

perpetuity for the salvation of all should be inherited by his successors, in whom the same permanent authority of Peter himself should continue' (p. xxxvi).¹

We pass by the remarkable dogmatism of the assertion, following the statement that we must see what is necessary by examining the teaching of Christ, that our Lord 'was obliged'² 'to designate a vice-gerent on earth,' and turn to the evidence given to support the contention that Christ 'appointed Peter to be the head of the Church' and 'determined' that this 'authority' 'should be inherited by his successors.' To establish the appointment of St. Peter as head of the Church the three famous 'Petrine texts' are quoted: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven';³ 'Feed my lambs,' 'feed my sheep';⁴ 'Confirm thy brethren'⁵ (pp. xxxvi-xli).

On this use of the 'Petrine texts' we have two comments to make. In the first place, if they could rightly be used to support an argument that by them our Lord 'appointed Peter to be the head of the Church,' it could only be as such an interpretation should derive authority from 'consent of the Fathers.' It is obvious that the texts do not in themselves necessarily bear any such meaning as the Pope, in common with Roman Catholic writers generally, ascribes to them. In the passage from St. Matthew's Gospel, taken by itself, there is nothing to show decisively in what sense the word 'rock' is used, what is the meaning of the gift of the 'keys of the kingdom of heaven,' and whether the promise 'whatsoever thou shalt bind,' 'whatsoever thou shalt loose,' has the same or a different significance when spoken to St. Peter, and when addressed to the other Apostles.⁶ And similarly, the

¹ 'Jesus Christus igitur summum rectorem Ecclesiæ Petrum dedit, idemque sanxit ut ejusmodi magistratus salutis communi ad perennitatem institutus, ad successores hereditate transferretur, in quibus Petrus ipse esset auctoritate perpetua superstes' (p. 33).

² The Latin phrase 'designare debuit' is not fairly represented by the 'He was obliged to designate' of the authorized English translation. But the statement is no less arbitrary and *a priori* in the Latin than in the English. We may take this opportunity of saying that we think the Pope's representatives in England ought to have secured that his letter should appear in English in a more scholarly translation and with more careful references.

³ St. Matt. xvi. 18-19.

⁵ St. Luke xxii. 32.

⁴ St. John xxi. 15-17.

⁶ St. Matt. xviii. 18.

commands 'confirm thy brethren,' 'feed my lambs,' 'feed my sheep,' are in themselves at least as easily interpreted in senses which do not in any way support the Papal claims as in that which is assigned to them in this Encyclical.

Now, 'consent of the Fathers' in support of the Papal interpretation is exactly what we do not find. The 'rock' is sometimes interpreted of St. Peter, sometimes of our Lord, sometimes of the true faith in Christ.¹ The gift of the keys, the promise of power to bind and loose, are regarded as the common possession of the Apostles.² If St. Chrysostom in one passage connects the prominent part taken by St. Peter in the election of St. Matthias with the command 'Stablish thy brethren,'³ he himself elsewhere gives a different explanation of our Lord's words,⁴ and the Fathers generally do not appear to have observed that the passage had any bearing on the government of the Church.⁵ And so, too, in the case of the command 'feed my lambs,' 'feed my sheep,' there is Patristic authority for seeing in it a renewal of the gift of the Apostolate marking the forgiveness of St. Peter's fall, or for taking

¹ E.g. St. Augustine interprets it of the apostolate of St. Peter in *Psal. c. part. Don.*; of St. Peter in *In Psal. xxx. Enarr.* iii. 5, *In Psal. lxx. Enarr.* 4; of Christ in *Serm. lxxvi. 1, Tract. in Evang. Joan.* cxxiv. 5; cf. *Retract.* i. 21. Origen explains it first as 'every disciple of Christ,' and then of the Apostles generally: see *Comm. in Mat.* tom. xii. 10-11. Tertullian explains it as St. Peter in *De præsc. hæc.* 22, and *De judic.* 21; as Christ in *Adv. Marc.* iv. 13. It is interpreted of faith in Christ by St. Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trin.* ii. 23, vi. 36, 37; St. Chrysostom, *Hom. in Mat.* liv. 2, *Hom. in Gal., ad init.*; St. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Isa.* iv. 2, *Dial. de Trin.* 4; St. Epiphanius, *Adv. Hær.* lix. 7; of St. Peter by Ps.-Basil, *Comm. in Esai.* ii. 66; St. Ambrose, *Expos. in Luc.* vi. 97, 98; St. Epiphanius, *Ancor.* 9. St. Jerome takes it of the chair of Peter in *Ep.* xv. 2; of St. Peter in *Comm. in Mat.* xvi. 18; of the Apostles generally in *Adv. Jov.* i. 26; of Christ in *Adv. Jov.* ii. 37. It should be observed that both Ps.-Basil and St. Ambrose, in interpreting of St. Peter, associate others.

² E.g. Origen, *Comm. in Mat.* tom. xii. 11; St. Ambrose, *Comm. in Psalm.* xxxviii. 37; St. Augustine, *Serm.* ccxcv. 2.

³ St. Chrysostom, *In Act. Ap. Hom.* iii. 3.

⁴ St. Chrysostom, *In Mat. Hom.* lxxii. 3.

⁵ It is interpreted in the most various ways: as showing that Christ prays for our sins, by St. Cyprian, *Ep.* vii. 5, *De Orat. Dom.* 30; as a sign that the power of Satan in temptation is under the control of God, by Tertullian, *De fug. in persec.* 2; as illustrating the general dealings of God with men, by St. Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trin.* x. 38, St. Basil, *Hom. de humil.* 4, St. Ambrose, *In Psal. xliii.* 40, St. Augustine, *In Psal. cxviii. Serm.* xiii. 3; as illustrating man's need of Divine grace, by St. Augustine, *De grat. et lib. arb.* 9, St. Jerome, *Dial. c. Pelag.* ii. 16; as specially referring to St. Peter, by St. Leo, *Serm.* iv. 3, 4; as referring to all the Apostles, by Pseudo-Ignatius, *Ad Smyrn.* long recension, 7, *Apostolical Constitutions*, vi. 5.

it as
interp
See o
Bu
passag
texts
own a
on the
the to
Pacian
might
Pacian
injunc

¹ St
15-17)
xxx. (§
² P

in opp
absolve
prove t
while t
of any
illud ab
sent in
catechu
licer et
conjunc
tegre p
erat D
Patris,
"Si cuj
tur";
tinuiss
solvend
duo di
invicem
impleb
Homin
tabula
tale ali
suam c
in cele
Mattha
tionem
posuit
voluiss
quaeris
doces
paulo s
tatem
[al. pra
inquit,

it as applying equally to all the Apostles,¹ methods of interpretation which do not tend to support the claims of the See of Rome.

But, it will be asked, does not the Pope himself quote passages from the Fathers to substantiate his use of the three texts? Certainly he does, and by so doing has destroyed his own argument and brought no new credit either on himself or on the See which in very many respects he so worthily fills. On the text in St. Matthew's Gospel, he quotes the words of Pacian: 'To Peter the Lord spoke: to one therefore, that he might establish unity upon one'; he does not quote what Pacian goes on to say, 'And soon He was to give the same injunction to the general body,'² or explain that the context

¹ See St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. in Joan. Evang.* lib. xii. (on xxi. 15-17); St. Augustine, *Serm.* ccxcv. 4, ccxcvi. 3, 5, 11, *De agon. Christ.* xxx. (§ 32).

² Pacian, *Ad Semp. Ep.* iii. 11. In this passage Pacian is arguing, in opposition to a Novatian opponent, that post-baptismal sin may be absolved; and he refers to our Lord's words to St. Peter in order to prove that the power of forgiving such sins is in the Church. It is worth while to quote a considerable part of the context, as showing the absence of any reference of any kind to the Papacy. 'Jam quam argute caput illud absolvis, quod ego posui; datam episcopis potestatem, ut quæ ligasset in terra, ligata essent et in cœlis. Dicis, hoc non ad fideles, sed ad catechumenos pertinere; ut baptizandos adhuc scilicet populis, solvi liceret crimina, vel teneri. Duorum denique Evangelistarum capitula conjungis, ut unum esse videatur; et adjicis, quod Matthæus minus integre prosecutus sit, complesse Joannem: ut quia apud Matthæum dixerat Dominus "Ite et docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eas in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti"; apud Joannem impleverit dicens "Si cujus dimiseritis peccata, dimittentur illi; cujus retinueritis et tenebuntur"; ut hoc dimittere vel ligare ad gentes quæ baptizandæ erant, pertinuisse videatur, quia prior Evangelista de gentibus prælocutus sit; de solvendo autem et ligando posterior impleverit. Quid ais? Evangelistæ duo dimidiatos invicem sensus, et semi-integros retulerunt? Verba his invicem, ratiove defuerat; aut non in omnibus totum Spiritus sanctus implebat, propositos perferens sensus, et ad plenum dicta definiens? Hominis confirmatum testamentum nemo superordinat: Dei tabulam, tabula diversa mutabit? Quænam in vobis hæc vincendi cupido est, ut tale aliquid audeatis? Quid quod apud Matthæum ipsum ante passionem suam dixerat Dominus: "Quaecumque ligaveritis in terra, erunt ligata et in cœlo et quaecumque solveritis in terra erunt soluta et in cœlo"? Apud Matthæum hoc prædixerat Dominus, et nullam ibi gentium fecerat mentionem; cur ergo illi capitulum Joannis adjungis, ubi suum posuit, et ita posuit ut a gentibus separaret? Quod utique si ad gentes pertinere voluisset, potuit ipse conjungere quod ipse ponebat. Totum ergo quod quæris, apud Matthæum habes. Cur non universa legisti, qui episcopum doces? Primum præcepti istius caput repete. Ipso referente Matthæo, paulo superius ad Petrum locutus est Dominus: ad unum, ideo ut unitatem fundaret ex uno; mox id ipsum in commune præcipiens, qualiter [*al.* præcipiens æqualiter,] tamen ad Petrum incipit: "Et ego tibi dico," inquit, "quia tu es Petrus, et super istam petram ædificabo Ecclesiam

conclusively shows that the point in view is concerned with the powers of the Bishops generally, not of the Papacy. He quotes St. Cyril of Alexandria saying, 'He aptly names him Peter, from *petra* the rock, since upon him He was about to found His Church'; he does not quote St. Cyril of Alexandria when he says that the 'rock' was the unshaken and most firm faith of the disciple, or that St. Peter and St. John were of 'equal honour.'¹ He quotes some sentences from Origen as if they supported his contention, and omits the words in which, in this very passage, Origen emphatically says

'But if you think that the whole Church is built by God upon Peter alone, what will you say of John the Son of thunder, or each one of the Apostles? Are we to dare to say that the gates of hell shall not prevail against Peter only, but that against the other Apostles, and those who are perfect, they shall prevail? Are not the words in question, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it," and "Upon this rock I will build my Church," said of them all, and of each single one of them? Are the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven given by the Lord to Peter only? And shall no other of the blessed men receive them?'²

He quotes from St. Chrysostom that our Lord 'gave to a mortal man all power in heaven when He handed him' (*i.e.* St. Peter) 'the keys';³ he does not quote the same Father when he explains the 'rock' as the 'faith of his confession,'⁴ or when he uses about the powers of the priesthood generally the language which he applies to St. Peter.⁵ He quotes the Pseudo-Basil interpreting the 'rock' of St. Peter, though the

meam, et portæ infernorum non convalescent adversus eam. Et tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum: et quæcunque ligaveris super terram, ligata erunt et in cœlis: et quæcunque solveris super terram, erunt soluta et in cœlis. Dic frater: de solis gentibus hoc locutus est: "Super hanc petram ædificabo," inquit, "Ecclesiam meam"? Ecclesiam, non baptizatos gentes vocat? Homo necdum renatus, corpus est Christi? Quid solvo gentibus, quod non est ligatum? Nam si non reputatum est, nec ligatum. Quid abligo, quod nullo jure constringo? Gentilis homo, liber est Legi.'

¹ St. Cyril of Alexandria, *In Evan. Joan.* lib. ii. (on i. 42); *Dial. de Trin.* 4; *Ad Nest. Ep.* iii. 5.

² Origen, *Comm. in Mat.* tom. xii. 11: Εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν ἕνα ἐκείνον Πέτρον νομίζεις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκοδομεῖσθαι τὴν πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν μόνον, τί ἂν φήσας περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ τῆς βροντῆς υἱοῦ, ἡ ἐκάστου τῶν ἀποστόλων; ἄλλως τε ἄρα τολμήσωμεν λέγειν ὅτι Πέτρον μὲν ἰδίως πύλαι ἁδου οὐ κατισχύσουσι, τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν τελείων κατισχύσουσιν; οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων, καὶ ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὸ προειρημένον, τὸ πύλαι ἁδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς, γίνεται; καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν; ἄρα δὲ τῷ Πέτρῳ μόνῳ δίδονται ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου αἱ κλεῖδες τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἕτερος τῶν μακαρίων αὐτῶς λήφεται;

³ St. Chrysostom, *In Mat. Hom.* liv. 2.

⁴ St. Chrysostom, *ibid.*

⁵ St. Chrysostom, *De Sacerd.* iii. 5.

passage is not really favourable to the Papal claims, and he does not add that when a writer similarly classed with St. Basil explains that the 'rock' is St. Peter, he says also that St. Peter was 'one of the mountains' upon which the Church was built.¹ Again, on the text in St. John's Gospel, the Pope quotes St. Ambrose saying 'because Peter alone of all others professes his love he is preferred to all';² he does not quote his explanation of the threefold question and answer as blotting out the fall of the threefold denial.³ He quotes St. Chrysostom stating that our Lord 'handed over' 'the sheep' 'to Peter and his successors'; he does not add that the general argument of the treatise renders it likely that the word 'successors' refers to bishops in general.⁴ He quotes the same Father describing St. Peter as 'pre-eminent among the Apostles,' 'the mouth-piece of the Apostles,' 'the head of the Apostolic College,' to whom our Lord 'commits' 'the government of his brethren';⁵ he does not allow for the probability that the words 'his brethren' refer to Christians generally, not the Apostles,⁶ or explain that elsewhere St. Chrysostom speaks of St. Andrew, St. James, and St. John in the same terms which are here applied to St. Peter.⁷ Lastly, on the text in St. Luke's Gospel, he quotes St. Ambrose asking 'Could not Christ who confided to him the kingdom by His own authority have strengthened the faith of one whom He designated a rock to show the foundation of the Church?'⁸ He does not quote the passage in which St. Ambrose interprets the text as illustrative of the general dealings of God with men.⁹ If the Pope was given all his Patristic quotations on the interpretation of the three texts, they would not afford a 'consent of the Fathers'; still less do they when they are examined with the result that the method of quotation may be clearly seen to be misleading and unfair.

We have no wish to deny that St. Peter was our Lord's chief Apostle, or that the See of Rome possessed a primacy in the early Church. What we do most emphatically deny is

¹ Ps.-Basil, *Comm. in Esai.* ii. 66.

² St. Ambrose, *Expos. in Evang. sec. Luc.* x. 175-6.

³ St. Ambrose, *Apol. David.* ix. 50; *De obitu Theodos.* 19.

⁴ See Puller, *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, pp. 383-4.

⁵ St. Chrysostom, *In Joan. Hom.* lxxxviii. 1.

⁶ ἡ προστασία τῶν ἀδελφῶν (the rule or presidency over the brethren) and ἡ προστασία τῶν προβάτων (the rule or presidency over the sheep) are used as equivalent phrases; see Puller, *ibid.* pp. 385-7.

⁷ St. Chrysostom, *In Mat. Hom.* xxxvii. 4, *In Joan. Hom.* i. 1, lxxxviii. 2; cf. *In Ep. ii. ad Cor. Hom.* xxv. 2; *In Gal. Hom.* on i. 18.

⁸ St. Ambrose, *De fide*, iv. 56.

⁹ St. Ambrose, *In Psal. xliii.* 40.

that in the three 'Petrine texts' themselves or in any 'consent of Fathers' about them there is ground for the assertion that our Lord 'appointed Peter to be the head of the Church.'

Our second comment on the Pope's use of these texts is that even if it should have been proved that in them our Lord 'appointed Peter to be the head of the Church,' there would still be need of definition as to what this office would involve. The Pope speaks with contempt of 'a primacy of honour and the shadowy right of giving advice and admonition, which is called *direction*' (p. xxxvii),¹ asserts that 'it is absolutely necessary that he should have received real and sovereign authority which the whole community is bound to obey' (p. li),² and says that 'it is only by this power of jurisdiction that nations and commonwealths are held together' (p. xxxvii).³ In so writing, did he forget that in 'nations and commonwealths' there are such things as constitutional governments and limited monarchies, there are such persons as the Queen of England and the President of the United States?

We come next to the further contention with regard to the Roman Pontiffs as the successors of St. Peter:

'It was necessary that a government of this kind, since it belongs to the constitution and formation of the Church, as its principal element—that is, as the principle of unity and the foundation of lasting stability—should in no wise come to an end with St. Peter, but should pass to his successors from one to another' (p. xlii).⁴

In connexion with this subject, while we agree with the underlying position that the Church herself must decide how her teaching office and her other powers are to be exercised, we entirely dissent from the representation given of what that decision has been.

We pass by, as in the similar instance with regard to the appointment of a 'vice-gerent' by our Lord, the dogmatic

¹ 'Principatus honoris ac pertenuis illa consulendi monendique facultas, quam *directionem* vocant, nulli hominum societati admodum prodesse neque ad unitatem neque ad firmitudinem queunt' (p. 34).

² 'Fidei et communionis unitati rite conservandæ, non gerere honoris causa priores partes, non curam agere satis est; sed omnino auctoritate est opus vera eademque summa, cui obtemperet tota communitas' (p. 48).

³ 'Profecto non nisi potestate jurisdictionis stant civitates resque publicæ' (p. 34).

⁴ 'Ejusmodi autem principatum, quoniam constitutione ipsa temperationeque Ecclesiæ, velut pars præcipua, continetur, videlicet ut principium unitatis ac fundamentum incolumitatis perpetuæ, nequaquam cum beato Petro interire, sed recidere in ejus successores ex alio in alium oportuit' (pp. 39-40).

assertion
'should
another
cites in
from S
the dec
Lateran
Pontiff,
to rule,
Roman
jurisdic
Council
and the
Lateran
anything
the thin
to add

'Th
which e
the Bish
of St. P

Wh
Rome
such m
quoting
'on acc
every

¹ He
from the
as well

² St.
³ Co

Pontific
Roman
Christi
patrem
guberna
potestat
concilio
986-7.

⁴ Co
omnes
versoru

⁵ A
ulla dul
success

⁶ P
dissere
litate

assertion 'It was necessary' that a government of this kind 'should pass to' the 'successors' of St. Peter 'from one to another,' and proceed to examine the authorities which the Pope cites in support of his case. After a preliminary quotation from St. Leo,² to whose teaching we intend to return, he cites the declarations of the Council of Florence and the Fourth Lateran Council that 'full power was given to' the 'Roman Pontiff,' 'in Blessed Peter, by our Lord Jesus Christ to feed, to rule, and to govern the Universal Church'³ and that 'the Roman Church' 'by the will of Christ obtains primacy of jurisdiction over all other Churches.'⁴ The late date of the Council of Florence and the repudiation of it by the East, and the late date and purely Western character of the Fourth Lateran Council prevent this testimony in itself from showing anything more than Western acceptance of Papal claims in the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries; and the Pope hastens to add:

'These declarations were preceded by the consent of antiquity which ever acknowledged, without the slightest doubt or hesitation, the Bishops of Rome, and revered them, as the legitimate successors of St. Peter' (p. xliii).⁵

Who, then, are the Fathers who describe the Bishops of Rome as the 'successors' of St. Peter, and in what sense has such name been applied to them? The Pope begins by quoting St. Irenæus to the effect that with the Roman Church, 'on account of its pre-eminent authority, it is necessary that every Church should be in concord' (p. xliii).⁶ Let us

¹ Here, again, the English 'it was necessary' is somewhat different from the Latin 'oportuit,' but the *a priori* argument exists in the Latin as well as in the English.

² St. Leo, *Serm.* iii. 3.

³ *Conc. Flor.*: 'Definimus, sanctam Apostolicam Sedem et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri, principis Apostolorum, et verum Christi vicarium totiusque Ecclesiæ caput, et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere, et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse; quemadmodum etiam in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur.' See Hard. *Conc.* ix. 986-7.

⁴ *Conc. Lat.* iv.: 'Romana Ecclesia . . . disponente Domino, super omnes alias ordinariæ potestatis obtinet principatum, utpote mater universorum Christifidelium et magistra.' See Hard. vii. 23.

⁵ 'Antecesserat consensus antiquitatis, quæ episcopos romanos sine ulla dubitatione sic semper observavit et coluit ut beati Petri legitimos successores' (pp. 40-1).

⁶ 'Illud valde præclarum Irenæi qui cum de Ecclesia romana dissereret, "ad hanc enim," inquit, "Ecclesiam propter potiorem principalem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam"' (p. 41).

examine what the teaching of St. Irenæus really is. His appeal is made, in view of the heretical perversions which mar the force of arguments from Holy Scripture, to the doctrine of the Universal Church. The tradition which the Bishops of the various Churches have received and delivered is the truth. But because of the difficulty with which an individual would collect the teaching of the Churches throughout the world, he points to the Church of Rome as a convenient instance of the universal tradition. And he adds that 'to this Church, on account of its higher eminence, it is necessary for every Church to resort, that is to say the faithful who are from all quarters; and in it the tradition which is from the Apostles has ever been preserved by those who are from all quarters.'¹ There is nothing said about the Bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter; there is nothing said about any inherent infallibility or jurisdiction in the Roman See. All that is said, as is clear from the part of the passage which the Pope does not quote, is that the greatness, either of the Church or of the city of Rome,² leads Christians from all quarters to visit it, and that it is these representatives of the Universal Church, not the authorities of the Roman Church, who have preserved the Apostolic Faith. The passage is parallel to that in the writings of Tertullian where, speaking like Irenæus of the need of appealing to the Universal Church, since heretics distort Holy Scripture, and referring to the high privilege of the Church at Rome as the place of the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul, and of the miraculous deliverance of St. John, he says that one Christian is to inquire at Corinth, another at Philippi or Thessalonica, another at Ephesus, another at Rome, according as one of these churches may be near at hand, and he finds the guarantee that the teaching is Apostolic, not because the Bishop of Rome inherits any powers of

¹ Irenæus, *C. Hær.* III. iii. 1-2: 'Sed quoniam valde longum est, in hoc volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximæ, et antiquissimæ, et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ ecclesiæ, eam quam habet ab Apostolis traditionem, et annuntiatam hominibus fidem, per successiones Episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquo modo vel per sibi placentiam malam, vel vanam gloriam, vel per cæcitatem et malam sententiam, præterquam oportet colligunt. Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio.' See the excellent treatment of the phrase 'convenire ad' in Puller, *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, pp. 32-40.

² On this point see Puller, *ibid.* pp. 40-43.

St. Pe
another
From

'St.
and mo
principa
xiv).³

It i
The pl
from a
'chair
their co
nothing
unity o
with th
Corneli
Corneli
that in
does no
Church
the Ca
letter t
to the
the ph
learnt
relation

¹ Ter
melius e
apud qu
apud qu
et repræ
Corinthu
Thessalo
Italiæ ad
Ista quan
profunder
Joannis
igneum
quid did
tesserari

² 'Ac
clesiæ ca
principal

³ In t
show this
disguise

⁴ St.
⁵ Thi
in Puller

St. Peter, but because different Churches agree with one another.¹

From St. Irenæus the Pope goes on to St. Cyprian :

'St. Cyprian also says of the Roman Church, that "it is the root and mother of the Catholic Church, the chair of Peter, and the principal Church whence sacerdotal unity has its source"' (pp. xliii-xliv).²

It is to be observed that this is a composite quotation.³ The phrase 'root and mother of the Catholic Church'⁴ is from a different letter than that which contains the phrases 'chair of Peter' and 'the principal Church.'⁵ Regarded in their context, the words 'root' and 'womb' ('matrix') have nothing to do with the Roman Church. They refer to the unity of the whole Church. At Rome, indeed, connexion with this unity was to be maintained by adherence to Pope Cornelius, not to Novatian ; but the reason of this was that Cornelius was in communion with the whole Church, not that in the Papacy itself lay inherent powers. The phrase does not mean the 'root and womb' from which the Catholic Church comes, but the 'root and womb' which consists of the Catholic Church.⁶ In the passage from the other letter the words 'chair of Peter,' 'the principal Church' refer to the Church at Rome. The inferences to be drawn from the phrase 'chair of Peter' depend entirely on what is to be learnt elsewhere as to the privileges of St. Peter, his own relation to the Church at Rome, and the relation of the

¹ Tertullian, *De præsc. hæc.* 36: 'Age jam, qui voles curiositatem melius exercere in negotio salutis tuæ, percurrere ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ apostolorum suis locis præsentur, apud quas ipsæ authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem et repræsentantes faciem uniuscujusque. Proxima est tibi Achaia, habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippos, habes Thessalonicenses. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiæ adjaces, habes Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est. Ista quam felix ecclesia, cui totam doctrinam apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt, ubi Petrus passioni dominicæ adæquatur, ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur, ubi apostolus Joannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur. Videamus, quid didicerit, quid docuerit, quid cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis contesserarit.'

² 'Ac Cyprianus itidem de Ecclesia romana affirmat eam esse Ecclesiæ catholicæ radicem et matricem, Petri Cathedram atque Ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est' (p. 41).

³ In the Latin text of the Encyclical the references are placed so as to show this : in the authorised English translation they are placed so as to disguise it.

⁴ St. Cyprian, *Ep.* xlv. 2.

⁵ *Ibid.* lv. 19.

⁶ This passage is discussed at length with much scholarship and skill in Puller, *op. cit.* pp. 338-47.

Bishops of Rome to him and his privileges; it is a phrase which could be used either by an English Churchman or by an Ultramontane. Similarly, in the case of the words 'principal Church,' whether they mean 'ancient Church' or 'first Church,' they could be used by any person acknowledging a primacy of the Roman See, of whatever nature that primacy might be. The last part of the quotation is wrongly translated in the English edition of the Encyclical. It is not 'whence sacerdotal unity has its source,' but 'whence sacerdotal unity had its source.' As has been admirably stated, St. Cyprian 'is referring to a historical fact which took place long before, namely, the original derivation of the true canonical episcopate of North Africa from the mother-Church of the West.'¹ Or, to quote a recent writer, St. Cyprian 'is describing, not a permanent relation, but a fact of past history.'²

Shortly after, there is another quotation from St. Cyprian:

'So, too, St. Cyprian: "To be in communion with Cornelius is to be in communion with the Catholic Church"' (p. xlv).³

Here, St. Cyprian is stating the fact, that the true line of succession at Rome is that of Cornelius, not that of Novatian. Looked at in its context, this passage has nothing whatever to do with the position and powers of the See of Rome.⁴

We shall have occasion later to return to the teaching of St. Cyprian. We have said enough here to show that the present quotations, when they are fairly examined, cannot be held to be justifiably used as having any bearing at all on the Roman claim to a specific jurisdiction.

In connexion with the passages from St. Cyprian, the Pope quotes also from St. Jerome and St. Augustine:

'Jerome addresses Damasus thus: "My words are spoken to the successor of the Fisherman, to the disciple of the Cross. . . I communicate with none save your Blessedness, that is, with the chair of Peter. For this I know is the rock on which the Church is built." Union with the Roman See of Peter is to him always the

¹ Puller, *op. cit.* p. 56.

² See the Church Historical Society's pamphlet entitled *The Encyclical 'Satis cognitum'*, p. 11. This admirable little tract contains a great deal of very valuable criticism in a short form. The cordial thanks of English Church people are due to the Church Historical Society for the publication of it.

³ 'Item Cyprianus: Communicare cum Cornelio, "hoc est cum catholica Ecclesia communicare"' (p. 42). St. Cyprian, *Ep.* lii. 1.

⁴ The point in view clearly was that Cornelius and not Novatian was the true Bishop of Rome. The question was simply as to which of the two bodies at Rome was the true Church.

public
united
public
existed
dissent
be look
that th

No
Jerom
could
nature
Rome
That i
St. Jer
the pu
of his
positio
the Pa
questio
answer
St. Ba
already

'Ta
Catholi
undoub
novice
but a n
metrop
had bef
cate wit
Rome s
Meletiu

The
claims

¹ 'Q
piscatori
drae Pet
Ecclesia
cum rom
meus es
romana
negat es
veram fi
romanam

² The
those of
Rome.

³ Pul
VOL.

public criterion of a Catholic. "I acknowledge everyone who is united with the See of Peter." And for a like reason St. Augustine publicly attests that "the primacy of the Apostolic chair always existed in the Roman Church"; and he denies that anyone who dissents from the Roman faith can be a Catholic. "You are not to be looked upon as holding the true Catholic faith if you do not teach that the faith of Rome is to be held" (p. xlv).¹

None of these quotations will bear much thought. St. Jerome, in the troubles of the disputed succession at Antioch, could indeed say, with the vehemence which marked his nature, that he would accept the Bishop whom the Bishop of Rome declared to be the rightful occupant of the See. That it cannot rightly be inferred from this one case that to St. Jerome 'union with the Roman See of Peter is' 'always the public criterion of a Catholic' is clear from other parts of his writings;² and that, even if this were not so, his position would not afford any sound argument in support of the Papal claims may be seen by considering that the same question as to the succession at Antioch was differently answered by great Saints of the Church, as, for instance, by St. Basil, of whom it has been said by a writer we have already quoted :

'Take St. Basil as an example. He was the great leader of the Catholic army of the East ; fighting a tremendous battle with heresy ; undoubtedly the most heroic man of his time. Not a comparative novice like St. Jerome, who had only been baptized ten years before, but a man in the maturity of his power, forty-seven years old, the metropolitan of the great see of Cæsarea in Cappadocia. He also had before him the same question to decide. Should he communicate with Meletius, whom Rome rejected, or with Paulinus, whom Rome supported? He decided the question by communicating with Meletius and by rejecting Paulinus.'³

The quotations from St. Augustine do not serve the Papal claims to any better purpose. The first of them merely

¹ "Quare Hieronymus iis verbis Damasum affatur "Cum successore piscatoris et discipulo crucis loquor. . . . Beatitudini tuæ, id est Cathedræ Petri communione consocior. Super illam petram ædificatam Ecclesiam scio." Solemne illi est, catholicum hominem ex conjunctione cum romana Petri sede internoscere : "Si quis Cathedræ Petri jungitur, meus est." Neque absimili ratione Augustinus, palam testatus, "in romana Ecclesia semper Apostolicæ cathedræ viguisse principatum" negat esse catholicum, quicumque a fide romana dissentiat : "Non crederis veram fidem tenere catholicam, qui fidem non doces esse servandam romanam" (pp. 41-2).

² The general position and some expressions in *Ep.* cxlvi. are not those of a writer who is attaching any very high authority to the See of Rome.

³ Puller, *op. cit.* p. 171.

asserts the existence of a traditional 'primacy' in the Roman Church, a point which no sensible English Churchman thinks of denying. The second does not occur in the sermon by St. Augustine to which both the Latin text and the English translation of the Encyclical refer. We have diligently searched for it in every likely place in the writings of St. Augustine and failed to find it. It is impossible for us, not having the context of the passage before us, to express a confident opinion as to what its meaning may be. If it is by St. Augustine, we think it not unlikely the context may show it to be a statement of the obvious truth that the Creed of the Church of Rome was a type of orthodox Creeds. We challenge any Roman Catholic students of the Fathers who may be readers of this *Review* to maintain and prove not only that the passage is by St. Augustine, but also that, regarded in the light of its context and history, it supports the claims made by the Pope.

The Encyclical goes on :

'In the same way Maximus the Abbot teaches that obedience to the Roman Pontiff is the proof of the true faith and of legitimate communion' (pp. xlv-xlv).¹

The passages which follow, which are strong assertions of the necessity of communion with the Roman See because of the gift of Christ and the laws of the Church, are quoted from the *Defloratio ex Epistola ad Petrum illustrem*² of Maximus the Abbot, the famous champion of Catholic truth in the Monothelite controversy in the seventh century. In the context from which the quotations are made, Maximus speaks of the fact that Pyrrhus, the Patriarch of Constantinople, 'damnatu est et abjectus ab apostolica sede Romanæ urbis' and declares emphatically that he must not be called by any honourable name until he has proved to the satisfaction of the See of Rome that he is worthy of it. Maximus gives as his reason the peculiar position of the Roman Church as described in the passages which the Pope quotes. So far, then, he is rightly claimed in the Encyclical; he used the words ascribed to him; there is nothing in the context of them to lessen their force. This is a point which must be allowed its proper place and right value in any consideration of the position and history of the Church of Rome. But we cannot think that the readers of the Encyclical, many of whom

¹ 'Similiter Maximus Abbas hanc veræ fidei veræque communionis notam esse docet, subesse Pontifici romano' (p. 42).

² Printed in Migne's *Patrologia Gr.-Lat.* vol. xci. col. 140-144.

are pr
stance
difficu
same
his wo
and S
and C
a date
regard
thelitel
Church
should
and of
by thi
the W

If
quotat
follow:
St. Cy
not est
the dis

'was a
nation
through

One w
the Se
witness

Th
for wh
by the
the Co
cedon

¹ 'Q
etas, se
atque ob

² 'N
beatissim
et Eccle
salvator
ac ligam
semper
Eph. Ac

³ 'P
Actio ii.

⁴ 'St
imitator

are probably without any intimate knowledge of the circumstances of the life of Maximus and would have some difficulty in distinguishing him from other persons of the same name, are quite fairly treated by the introduction of his words between quotations from St. Cyprian, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine and references to the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon without any indication that he lived at so late a date as the middle of the seventh century or any hint with regard to his personal history. His conflict with the Monothelites threw him into close connexion with the Western Church and with the Pope. It would be natural that he should be led by the general circumstances of this alliance and of the conflict in which he was engaged into what had by this time become the theory of the Papacy prevalent in the West.

If there is any justice in our criticism on the use made of quotations the whole of which we have thus gone through, it follows that the passages cited by the Pope from St. Irenæus, St. Cyprian, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and St. Maximus do not establish the conclusion which he rests upon them, that the distinctively Papal jurisdiction

'was acknowledged and observed as Christian faith, not by one nation only nor in one age, but by the East and by the West, and through all ages' (p. xlv).¹

One writer, whom controversy threw into peculiar relations with the See of Rome in the seventh century, is hardly a sufficient witness of the teaching of 'the East' 'through all ages.'

The Encyclical proceeds further to say that the doctrine for which universal consent has thus been claimed is recalled by the well-known words of Philip, the Pontifical legate at the Council of Ephesus² and the statements made at Chalcedon³ and the Third Council of Constantinople,⁴ 'Peter has

¹ 'Quod igitur erat in fide christiana, quod non una gens, aut una ætas, sed ætates omnes, et Oriens pariter atque Occidens agnoscere atque observare consueverat' (p. 43).

² 'Nulli dubium est, imo sæculis omnibus notum, quod sanctus beatissimusque Petrus, Apostolorum princeps et caput, fideique columna et Ecclesiæ catholicæ fundamentum, a Domino nostro Jesu Christo, salvatore humani generis ac redemptore, claves regni accepit, solvendique ac ligandi peccata potestas ipsi data est, qui ad hoc usque tempus et semper in suis successoribus vivit et iudicium exercet' (p. 43). *Conc. Eph.* Actio iii. Hard. i. 1477-8.

³ 'Petrus per Leonem . . . loquutus est' (p. 43). *Conc. Chalc.* Actio ii. Hard. ii. 305-6.

⁴ 'Summus nobiscum concertabat Apostolorum princeps: illius enim imitatore et Sedis successorem habuimus fautorem . . . charta et

spoken through Leo,' 'Peter spoke through Agatho' (pp. xlv-xlvi).

The words of Philip would not necessarily assert the distinctive jurisdiction of Rome. But it is of less importance to consider what was the meaning of the utterance of a Papal Legate at the Council of Ephesus than what was the attitude of the Council itself and of its illustrious president, St. Cyril of Alexandria. On this subject we may quote the clear statement of a writer of great insight and knowledge:

'One of the legates, *more Romano*, refers to our Lord's words to St. Peter, and affirms that the Apostle "up to this time and always lives and exercises judgment in his successors." . . . But what says Cyril himself? He takes care (*a*) to describe the legates as representing, not only "the Apostolical See," but "all the holy synod of the bishops of the West," and (*b*) to distinguish *their* action, as Celestine's real "agents," from the sentence already pronounced by the synod to which he requests their "assent" in writing. But does he, then, recognize them as giving the supreme sanction without which the act would not be properly valid? Not a word like this appears in the speech. . . . Does this declaration' (*i.e.* 'the subsequent declaration of the bishops that the legates had spoken *ἀπολούτως*') 'commit the Council to everything which a Roman envoy might say about the dignity of his master? Does not the context show that the Council was referring to the legates' agreement with its decisions?'¹

The phrases used at Chalcedon and the Third Council of Constantinople, 'Peter has spoken through Leo,' 'Peter spoke through Agatho' do not in themselves mean more than that these Popes were faithful to the doctrine believed by St. Peter²; and if we examine the bearing of the proceedings of these two Councils on the Papal claims we shall not find that those claims are to any extent supported by them. On the relation of the Council of Chalcedon to Pope Leo the Great, we may again quote from Dr. Bright:

'The Fourth Council did not "judge" of Cyril's teaching, because it had been solemnly adopted by the Third; but did it not . . . "judge" Leo's? Let us see. The bishops at Ephesus, in their individual affirmations, had approved of Cyril's teaching as expressed in his second letter to Nestorius *because* (as many of them said) they "found," or "saw," or "recognized," or "understood," or "ascertained"

atramentum videbatur, et per Agathonem Petrus loquebatur' (p. 43). *Conc. Constant. III.* Actio xviii. Hard. iii. 1421-4.

¹ Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, pp. 163-5. Cf. *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1895, pp. 289-90.

² Compare the phrase used by the Council of Chalcedon in accepting the Tome of St. Leo, *ὅτι δὴ τῇ τοῦ μεγάλου Πέτρου ὁμολογίᾳ συμβαίνουσιν*. *Conc. Chal. Def. fid.*, Hard. ii. 455-6.

it to be
upon en
Tome v
phrases
the Rom
persuade
the Cre
Council
able to
no way
differs—
your Sp
we to sa
to a w
only th
which,
their su
distincti
mean a
bishops
because
standar
and thu
Of the
to say
Honor
Th
faith d
" " P
' Thou
cannot
Catholi
stolic S
and la
It wou
in the
1 Br
Quarter
2 Ca
3 I
ineunte
Epipha
magna
Jesu Ch
petram
proban
catholic
translat
at the b

it to be consonant to the Creed. They thus "judged" it, and there-upon erected it into a standard. It was so regarded when Leo's Tome was dealt with at Chalcedon. Now, here are some of the phrases in which the bishops adhere to a document proceeding from the Roman chair. . . . "I have ascertained—I judge—I am fully persuaded—we find—we have found—that it is in accordance with the Creed," and, as many bishops add, "with the teaching of the Council of Ephesus" or "of Cyril." Or, "as far as I have been able to perceive," or "to understand, it agrees—I perceive that it in no way differs—we have proved by examination that it in no way differs—I find in it nothing divergent—I have found that it agrees—your Splendours [the commissioners] see that it agrees," etc. Are we to say that such language implies a real "judgment" when applied to a writing of Cyril's, but, when applied to one of Leo's, means only that the speakers now appreciate the grounds of a teaching which, independently of such appreciation, had a divine right to their submissive acceptance? Nothing in the Acts could warrant a distinction *prima facie* so arbitrary. If words on a solemn occasion mean anything, here is a series of declarations in which individual bishops, members of the Œcumenical Council, accept the Tome *because* they personally believe it to be conformable to Church standards, just as their predecessors had dealt with Cyril's letter; and thus by their act it acquires a place among Church standards.¹

Of the Third Council of Constantinople it is perhaps enough to say it was this Council which included the name of Pope Honorius in its anathema of Monothelite heresy.²

The Pope next quotes from 'the formula of Catholic faith drawn up and proposed by Hormisdas' the words

"For the pronouncement of our Lord Jesus Christ, saying: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church,' &c., cannot be passed over. What is said is proved by the result, because Catholic faith has always been preserved without stain in the Apostolic See" (p. xlvi).³

and lays stress on the fact that it was subscribed in the East. It would have been well to add some account of the rejection in the East of the rule of faith drawn by Hormisdas when it

¹ Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, pp. 187-9. Cf. *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1895, p. 299.

² *Conc. Constant. III.* Actio xviii. Hard. iii. 1398, 1414, &c.

³ 'In formula catholicæ professionis ab Hormisda conceptis verbis, ineunte sæculo sexto, proposita, cui tum Justinianus Imperator, tum Epiphanius, Joannes, et Menna Patriarchæ subscripserunt, illud est magna vi sententiarum declaratum: "Quia non potest Domini nostri Jesu Christi prætermitti sententia dicentis 'Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam' . . . hæc, quæ dicta sunt, rerum probantur effectibus, quia in Sede Apostolica citra maculam semper est catholica servata religio"' (pp. 43-4). We do not understand the English translation of the first part of this passage: it has 'which was subscribed at the beginning of the sixth century in the great Eighth Council.'

was first proposed, and of the preamble by which, when it was ultimately accepted, the Patriarch of Constantinople took pains to show that the acceptance of this true theological formula did not imply any allowance of the possession of exceptional powers by the Bishop of Rome and asserted the co-ordinate authority of his own see :

'Know therefore, most holy one, that, according to what I have written, agreeing in the truth with thee, I too, loving peace, renounce all the heretics repudiated by thee : for I hold the most holy Churches of God, that is of your elder and of this new Rome, to be one ; I define that see of the Apostle Peter and this of the imperial city to be one see.'¹

And the Second Council of Lyons (pp. xlvii-vii) can hardly be rightly quoted without some explanation of the relations between the Greek and the Latin Churches at the part of the thirteenth century at which this Council was held.²

After stating that the 'power' of the Bishops is 'really their own' and that 'they are not to be looked upon as vicars of the Roman Pontiffs' (p. xlvii), the Encyclical proceeds to explain their necessary dependence on the Pope. Here, again, the quotations are marked by similar characteristics to those upon which we have commented. St. Jerome is quoted as saying

'The safety of the Church depends on the dignity of the Chief Priest, to whom if an extraordinary and supreme power is not given, there are as many schisms to be expected in the Church as there are priests' (p. xlviii).³

It is quite true that St. Jerome uses these words. It would have been fairer to those readers who are not themselves students of the Fathers to tell them that when St. Jerome here speaks of the 'chief priest,' he is referring to the relation of the Bishop of a diocese to the priests under him,

¹ 'Certus igitur scito, per omnia sanctissime, quia secundum quod vobis scripsi, una tecum cum veritate sentiens, omnes a te repudiatos hæreticos renuo et ego, pacem diligens. Sanctissimas enim Dei ecclesias, id est, superioris vestræ et novellæ istius Romæ unam esse accipio : illam sedem apostoli Petri et istius Augustæ civitatis unam esse definio.' Joan. Constant. *Libellus fidei*. This 'libellus' is printed in Hardouin, *Concilia*, ii. 1017, and in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, vol. lxiii. col. 444.

² The Second Council of Lyons (1274 A.D.) formed part of an attempted reconciliation between the Greek and the Latin Churches on the basis of acceptance of the Papal Supremacy. The nominal reunion effected by the Council was hollow and short-lived.

³ 'Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet, cui si non exors quædam et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in Ecclesia efficientur schismata, quot sacerdotes' (p. 45). St. Jerome, *C. Lucif.* 9.

not to t
and tha
that wi
priest r

We
scribing
mouthp
(p. xlvii)
shown
of St.
phrases

The
Lord g
Apostl
not re
contran
be rig
But we
St. Leo
logical
must
appear
forced
involv
of his
the pa
that h
Bishop
Encycl
theolog

At

'W

¹ St
neque p

² 'P
caput'

³ In
clara di
of the b

⁴ St
ordinat

except
Pope a
See esp
Roman
regard

not to the relation of the Bishop of Rome to other bishops, and that he goes on to say 'For this reason it comes to pass that without the chrism and the order of the Bishop neither priest nor deacon has the right to baptize.'¹

We are next told of the words of St. Chrysostom describing St. Peter as 'pre-eminent among the Apostles, the mouthpiece of the disciples, and the head of the college' (p. xlviij),² with regard to which we have already sufficiently shown that if the Saint uses strong terms about the greatness of St. Peter, parallels to all of them may be found in the phrases which he applies to the other Apostles.

The passage quoted from St. Leo to the effect that our Lord gave through St. Peter all the gifts which the other Apostles received in common with him (pp. xlviij-ix) does not represent the whole of St. Leo's teaching³ and is so contrary to the facts of the Gospel history that it can hardly be rightly used to support any claim of the Roman See. But we are free to confess that some parts of the teaching of St. Leo with regard to the authority of his own office would logically lead to the present doctrine of Rome.⁴ That fact must be given its due weight. Its due weight does not appear to be more than that St. Leo, a strong resolute man, forced by the difficulties of his age to take a line which involved much assertion of authority, exaggerated the position of his own See. And it must be remembered in considering the passages in his writings which support the Papal claim that his contention that all jurisdiction comes through the Bishop of Rome is one which the Pope does not assert in the Encyclical and which is rejected by many Roman Catholic theologians at the present time.⁵

At this point the Encyclical returns to St. Cyprian:

'When the Divine Founder decreed that the Church should be

¹ St. Jerome, *ibid.*: 'Inde venit, ut sine chrismate et episcopi jussione, neque presbyter neque diaconus jus habeant baptizandi.'

² 'Eximius erat inter Apostolos, et os discipulorum, et coetus illius caput' (p. 46). St. Chrysostom, *In Joan. Hom.* lxxxviii. 1.

³ In *Serm.* lxxxii. 6, 7, he calls St. Peter and St. Paul 'duo ista præclara divini seminis germina,' and 'quasi geminum . . . lumen oculorum' of the body, 'cui caput est Christus.'

⁴ See especially *Serm.* iii. 3, iv. 2, v. 4; *Ep.* x. 1.

⁵ The Encyclical appears to regard the Episcopal jurisdiction as co-ordinate with the Papal jurisdiction, but as incapable of being exercised except in communion with the Pope. St. Leo distinctly speaks of the Pope as the channel through which the Bishops receive their jurisdiction. See especially *Ep.* x. 1. There are different schools of thought among Roman Catholic theologians on this point, but a large number do not regard the Pope as the exclusive channel of all episcopal jurisdiction.

one in faith, in government, and in communion, He chose Peter and his successors as the principle and centre, as it were, of this unity. Wherefore St. Cyprian says: "The following is a short and easy proof of the faith. The Lord saith to Peter: 'I say to thee thou art Peter'; and on him alone He buildeth His church; and although after His Resurrection He gives a similar power to all the Apostles and says: 'As the Father hath sent me' &c., still in order to make the necessary unity clear, by His own authority He laid down the source of that unity as beginning from one" (pp. xlix-l).¹

'Hence the teaching of Cyprian, that heresy and schism arise and are begotten from the fact that due obedience is refused to the supreme authority. "Heresies and schisms have no other origin than that obedience is refused to the priest of God, and that men lose sight of the fact that there is one judge in the place of Christ in this world" (p. l).²

Again we refer to the context of the quotations. And we find that in the second quotation the words 'the priest of God,' 'one judge in the place of Christ' are used to denote the Bishop of a diocese, not the Pope in relation to the other Bishops;³ and that the first quotation plainly means that the Apostolic gifts were spoken of to St. Peter in order to make a typical representation of the unity of the Church, and that the very same power which St. Peter had was possessed by all the Apostles. That this is the true meaning is made clear by the words which follow in St. Cyprian's treatise:

'The rest of the Apostles were the same as Peter was, endowed with an equal share of honour and power, but the start is made from oneness, that the Church of Christ may be proved to be one.'⁴

¹ 'Videlicet cum Ecclesiam divinus auctor fide et regimine et communione unam esse decrevisset, Petrum ejusque successores delegit in quibus principium foret ac velut centrum unitatis. Quare Cyprianus: "Probatio est ad fidem facilis compendio veritatis. Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum: 'Ego tibi dico,' inquit, 'quia tu es Petrus.' . . . Super unum ædificat Ecclesiam. Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat, et dicat: 'sicut misit me Pater' . . . tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit" (pp. 46-7). St. Cyprian, *De Unit. Eccl.* 4.

² 'Unde est illa ipsius Cypriani sententia, cum hæresim tum schisma ex eo ortum habere gignique, quod debita supremæ potestati obedientia abjicitur: "Neque enim aliunde hæreses obortæ sunt aut nata sunt schismata, quam inde quod sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in Ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos et ad tempus iudex vice Christi cogitatur" (pp. 47-8). St. Cyprian, *Ep.* lv. 5. Here again there is ground for complaining of the authorised English translation.

³ This is plain by observing that the point was with regard to the true succession, not the relation of the Bishop of Rome to other Bishops.

⁴ St. Cyprian, *De Unit. Eccl.* 4: 'Hoc erant utique cæteri apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur.'

two f
'Y
Episc
head
chair
Apost
that h
be a s
'A
saving
"to th
gates
you st
Heave

O
is not
other
conne
conte
sion
comm
There
Churc
by co
See o
mean
simila

W
writin
Hadr
exten
they
much
never
W

16
episco
Petrus
omnib
ut jam
altera
26
Petrus
claves
quod
dram

The next writer referred to is Optatus, from whom the two following quotations are made :

' You cannot deny that you know that in the city of Rome the Episcopal chair was first conferred on Peter. In this Peter, the head of all the Apostles (hence his name Cephas), has sat : in which chair alone unity was to be preserved for all, lest any of the other Apostles should claim anything as exclusively his own. So much so, that he who would place another chair against that one chair, would be a schismatic and a sinner.'¹

' Against which gates [of hell] we read that St. Peter received the saving keys, that is to say, our prince, to whom it was said by Christ : "to thee will I give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the gates of Hell shall not conquer them." Whence is it therefore that you strive to obtain for yourselves the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven—you who fight against the chair of Peter ?' (pp. l-li).²

Once again, the context shows the true meaning. Optatus is not discussing the relation of the Bishop of Rome to the other Bishops of the Church, as might be thought by the connexion in which he is quoted in the Encyclical ; he is contending that at Rome the Petrine is the Apostolic succession and that the Donatist Bishops in that city, and those in communion with them elsewhere, are therefore in schism. There might be many circumstances under which Anglican Churchmen might rightly say that unity was to be preserved by communion with the successor of St. Augustine in the See of Canterbury. They would not, by such a statement, mean to assert a jurisdiction for the Primate of All England similar to that claimed by the Pope.

We need not treat in any detail the references to the writings of St. Bruno, the Bishop of Segni, of St. Bernard, of Hadrian II. and Nicolas and Gelasius. Whatever the exact extent to which they may support what Rome now teaches, they represent a period when Western thought had conceded much to the Papacy which, from our standpoint, it ought never to have received.

We have completed, then, our examination of the whole of

¹ ' Negare non potes, scire te in urbe Roma Petro primo Cathedram episcopalem esse collatam, in qua sederit omnium Apostolorum caput Petrus, unde et Cephas appellatus est : in qua una Cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur : ne ceteri Apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent, ut jam schismaticus et peccator esset, qui contra singularem Cathedram alteram collocaret' (p. 47). St. Optatus, *De Schis. Don.* ii. 2.

² ' Contra quas portas (infernæ) claves salutares accepisse legimus Petrum, principem scilicet nostrum, cui a Christo dictum est : " tibi dabo claves regni cælorum, et portæ inferi non vincent eas." Unde est ergo, quod claves regni cælorum vobis usurpare contenditis, qui contra cathedram Petri . . . militatis ?' (p. 48). *Ibid.* ii. 4, 5.

the evidence from Patristic writers which the Pope brings to support his claim to jurisdiction in the distinctively Papal sense. It has not been a pleasant task. We could have wished that so great a Bishop would have risen above the methods which have made 'Roman quotations' a by-word among scholars. We have found that passage after passage which at first sight might seem to support the Papal position cannot be made to do so except for those who are blind to the surroundings and history of the words used. No attempt is made to estimate the general view of unity which runs through the writings of the Fathers. No attempt is made to consider the bearing of the history of Eastern Christians. As it can hardly be supposed that Pope Leo XIII. has purposely written what is unfair and will not bear examination, the nature of his argument can only be explained as the result of the habitual separation in thought of words and actions from their context and historical setting to which his theological standpoint has led.

These facts appear to us to be representative of the whole polemical attitude of the Church of Rome. There is much in the Roman system which has *a priori* plausibility, there is much which can be defended on the ground of words and actions of various times in the past, but the system itself is capable of defence only by shutting the eyes to whole groups of facts and whole periods of history. The Encyclical on Unity in our mind adds strength to a conviction which is the result of study and thought, that the claim of the Papal jurisdiction can be accepted only when the fair and complete treatment of history is ignored.

It is not sufficient to show that the Encyclical fails to establish its fundamental point. It is needful also to ask what the true Catholic doctrine of the unity of the Church is. We are following Holy Scripture and Catholic tradition, as well as much sound Anglican theology, when we lay down that the organic or objective unity of the Church consists in the worship of the one true God, the maintenance of the one Catholic faith, the use of the one Sacramental system, the aspiration towards the one hope of eternal life, and the possession of the one Holy Spirit of grace and truth. It is a unity which centres in Christ the Church's Head. It is accomplished and preserved by means of the historic Episcopate. It has in each of its departments an ideal which ought never to be forgotten. It has also a minimum, below which it cannot fall without ceasing to be. It joins together in communion, not less real because invisible, all those who in common

believ
to th
which
is as
U
bases
the o
there
inter-
is of
Chris
exclu
that t
It is
work
It is
Lord
peace
If
moral
ancien
ackno
influe
tween
of the

¹ E
langua
See Ep
is not
Greek
must b
Adam,
is in th
S. T. 1
² St
Smyrn
Sacram
St. Hil
³ T
pate, to
That th
interrup
loss of
out of
See on
see Pus
e.g. pp.
⁴ Ep
⁵ Se

believe the Church's Creeds and are united by the Sacraments to the one life of the Incarnate Word. It is this unity of which St. Paul¹ speaks and which St. Ignatius² teaches. It is as necessary as the Sacraments which make it possible.³

Upon the fact of the Church's organic unity St. Paul bases the duty of preserving the 'bond of peace.'⁴ Besides the objective unity which is a necessity of the Church's life, there is the subjective or moral unity which is realized in inter-communion, in friendship, in mutual help. This, indeed, is of high practical value. It is a terrible thing that fellow-Christians, who feed on the same Eucharistic food, should exclude one another from their altars. It is waste of power that those who ought to be allies should engage in controversy. It is mutual loss that those who ought to aid one another's work should abstain from help and sometimes actually hinder. It is contrary to the spirit of the teaching of the Church's Lord that her outward life should not be one of harmony and peace.⁵

If the Church should again possess the subjective or moral unity which she has lost, it would be natural that the ancient Primacy of the See of Rome should once more be acknowledged, and that the Bishop of this See should be an influence for maintaining inter-communion and friendship between different parts of the Church, typical to a certain extent of the way in which the necessary unity has its centre in our

¹ Eph. iv. 4, 5. This way of regarding unity is implied in St. Paul's language about the Church as the *σῶμα* of which Christ is the *κεφαλὴ*. See Eph. i. 23, v. 30; Col. i. 18, 24. The full significance of this language is not seen except when it is remembered that *σῶμα* was not an ordinary Greek word for an organized community. Cf. also St. John xv. 5. It must be remembered, also, that it is in His Humanity, as the Second Adam, that Christ is the Head of the Church. Consequently, the Head is in the same order of life as the rest of the Body. See St. Thom. Aq. S. 7. III, viii. 1.

² St. Ignat. *Ad Eph.* 5, 20; *Ad Trall.* 7; *Ad Philad.* 3, 4; *Ad Smyrn.* 6, 8. For the connexion between unity and the Episcopate and Sacraments compare, e.g., St. Cyprian, *De Unit. Eccl.* 4-5, *Ep.* lii. 20; St. Hilary, *De Trin.* viii. 7-13.

³ The necessity of the Sacraments, and consequently of the Episcopate, to the life of the Church is everywhere assumed by the Fathers. That they did not regard the essential unity spoken of above as being interrupted by the absence of communion with the See of Rome, or by loss of visible unity, is shown by the unanimity with which Christians out of communion with Rome were regarded as Saints of the Church. See on this point Puller, *op. cit.* pp. 235-320. On the two kinds of unity see Pusey, *Eirenicon*, part i. pp. 44-66; Manning, *Unity of the Church*, e.g. pp. 56-7, 67.

⁴ Eph. iv. 3, 4. Cf. Ro. xii. 4-5; 1 Cor. xii. 12-27.

⁵ See, e.g., St. Matt. xviii. 19; St. Mark ix. 50.

Lord.¹ To such a position no English Churchman need object, if the Papacy would shake itself clear from all touch of the policy which still makes many clear-headed and sound-minded Englishmen shudder at the thought of connexion with Rome.² But when we are told that to be separated from the Pope is to be separated from the Church, we can only say that we find no such doctrine in Holy Scripture or affirmed by the Universal Church, that we cannot reconcile it with very much in the writings of Catholic theologians, and in the facts of history. The acknowledged Saints who in the early centuries lived and died outside the communion of the See of Rome, the history of Eastern Christendom in later years, the acknowledged Saints on both sides in the struggles between Pope and anti-Pope bear witness that we are not wrong in our rejection of the Pope's appeal.

And if a more gentle voice should plead with us that it is our duty at any cost to put an end to disunion, we can only sadly reply that the terms upon which outward union with Rome is possible for us involve what to our consciences is a lie. Severed from Rome, we can still face God. United to Rome by means of asserting what we believe to be untrue, we could only hide ourselves in shame.

As outward disunion is a terrible thing, so also is the responsibility for it. There is much in our own past history and our present life over which Churchmen ought to deeply mourn. Yet the worst burden is not ours in England. For the severance in the sixteenth century the See of Rome is at least as responsible as any Churchmen in this country. The flagrant immorality, the shameless extortion, the refusal to recognize the need of reform which for long periods marked the ordinary life and policy of the Roman Court, joined with the utter failure to realize the needs of the time, are at least parallel to any sins of the English Church. And if Rome

¹ This typical character of the Bishop of Rome, if the Church should be externally united, would be parallel to the view of St. Peter as the symbol of unity in, e.g., St. Cyprian, *De Unit. Eccl.* 4-5, and in the parenthetical reference to unity in the passage already quoted at length from St. Pacian, *Ep.* iii. 11. Cf. St. Augustine's frequent references to St. Peter as the figure of the Church: see, e.g., *Ep.* liii. 2; *Serm.* xlv. 30, cxlix. 7; ccxcv. 2, 4; *In Joan. Evang. Tract.* cxviii. 4, cxxiv. 5; *Enarr. in Ps. cviii.* 1. In estimating these passages, however, it is necessary to keep in mind parallel statements about St. John (e.g. *In Joan. Evang. Tract.* cxiv. 1) and St. Mary Magdalen (e.g. *Ep.* cxx. 15; *In Joan. Evang. Tract.* cxxi. 3).

² The extortionate and oppressive policy of Rome towards England for many years before the Reformation, as well as later actions, have left a mark on English minds that still remains.

was
is Ro
riers
lish
1870
hope
stolic
V
days
conti
of th
the
have
Chur
herit
and
their
belie

A

Mem
R
(I

THESE
in the
family
and i
of the
Part
Roun
public
allow
only
count
but a
mind,
the ac
dear.
first t
was w
over a
the as

was at least as guilty as England in the sixteenth century, it is Rome which in this century has interposed the worst barriers to external reunion. There is nothing which the English Church has done so hurtful as the decrees of 1854 and 1870, nothing for which we are responsible which is so little hopeful as the Encyclical *Satis cognitum* and the Bull *Apostolicæ curæ*.

We do not despair of future reunion. Mindful of the days when Bishop Andrewes composed his *Devotions*, we can continue to pray even if the outlook is dark. The movement of thought does more than any official declarations. It is in the grace of God and not in the diplomacy of man that we have trust. And we are sure that the duty of English Churchmen at the present time is to be true to their own inheritance, to restore among themselves the fullness and balance and strength of Catholic truth and practice, and to see that their moral life corresponds to the Sacramental grace they believe they possess. *Spartam nactus es, hanc exorna.*

ART. II.—LORD SELBORNE'S 'MEMORIALS.'

Memorials. Part I.—Family and Personal, 1766–1865. By
ROUNDELL PALMER, Earl of Selborne. Vols. I. and II.
(London, 1896.)

THESE volumes contain, as we are told on the title-page and in the author's dedication to his children, the history of his family, particularly of members of it in his own generation and in that immediately preceding, and the personal record of the first fifty-three years of his own life. The promised Part II., which is to carry the narrative from 1865, when Sir Roundell Palmer was Attorney-General, to the close of his public life, will be awaited with deep interest; for it was allowed to Lord Selborne, dying in his eighty-third year, not only to leave behind him a name beloved by many of his countrymen for what he had been and for what he had done, but also to use to the end his singularly clear powers of mind, and to exhibit his unswerving stability of purpose, in the active defence of causes and institutions which he held dear. The purpose of the chapters now before us is to show, first to his descendants and then to the public, what the life was which made him. With this in view, he lived that life over again, during a time of retirement, in 1885; and, with the assistance of family letters, many of which are included

in the text, but otherwise relying on his unfailing memory, committed its record to writing. The date selected for the *terminus a quo*—1766—is the year of the marriage of his grandparents; the *terminus ad quem* is fixed by the death of Lord Palmerston in 1865, when a new order in English political history took the place of the old. It is significant that we have in one of the later chapters (chap. xlviii. vol. ii. p. 287) a careful review, in all its bearings, of the Irish Church Question, then soon to come into the region of practical politics; and are thus assisted to forecast the author's action in what will doubtless be remembered as the most critical phase of his public life.

The arrangement of the two volumes is not that which Lord Selborne had intended. He would have closed his first volume with the death of his father in 1853, and the second would have continued the story to the end. The greater number of letters belonging to the later years made such a division impossible; but it had a real significance, as marking the completeness of the break caused by the loss of a father who had for so many years watched from his quiet Oxfordshire rectory the career of his sons, rejoicing with them in their worldly success, and shrewdly estimating all which contributed to or hindered it, yet ever raising a clear, if modest, note of high-minded, sane, and most loving counsel.

'In this volume' (writes Lord Selborne), 'besides my own history from my birth till my father's death, I have had in view the preservation of the knowledge and memory of those dear relations and friends to whom (under God) I owe everything. Some of them, if their lives were quiet and unambitious, and to the world in general unknown, were in wisdom and virtue among the excellent of the earth. Of all the characters and influences here commemorated, that which it has been most a labour of love to me to delineate is your grandfather's; and if, in what you learn concerning him, you find the main interest of this work, I shall be rewarded' (vol. i. p. vii).

The daughter who edits these memorials expresses some natural reluctance, only overborne by her father's known intention and desire, to give to the world so much which is intimate and personal. We venture to reassure her: the world could ill spare the record of a family history of so great intrinsic beauty, traced by the pen of a master of exact and delicate expression; who can be homely without being trivial, outspoken, yet sure not to wound by an unguarded word reputations or feelings. Lord Selborne's Memorials contain a vast number of passing estimates of men of mark

of
acad
colou
writte
chari
the si
his c
corre
thing
himse

W
wish
striki

W
Willia
speron
of an
Comp
from
male
Horsl
St. A
born t
was c
brothe
much
year.
in the
longed
his sh
rock
dearly
especi
writes
consol

'W
will ass
soon.

'T
brave;
the co
on it'

W
being
Heber

of the most diverse temperaments in the ecclesiastical, academical, legal, and political worlds, not one of which is colourless; many are touched with a quiet humour, and written as from a full reserve fund of knowledge, and all are charitable. A characteristic which cannot fail to please is the simple candour with which the writer gives the side not his own, marking where his earlier judgment has been corrected by that of maturer years, and not shrinking, in things great or small, from telling a story quite against himself.

We shall certainly be following Lord Selborne's own wish if we first try to realize, in some of its features, the very striking personality of his father.

William Jocelyn Palmer was born in 1778, the third son of William Palmer and a grandson of Thomas Palmer, both prosperous and honoured merchants of the City of London, coming of an old Yorkshire stock, and both members of the Mercers' Company, the freedom of which descended to Lord Selborne from his great-grandfather, as to all male descendants of the male line. William Palmer had in 1766 married Mary Horsley, a sister of Samuel Horsley, the famous Bishop of St. Asaph and secretary of the Royal Society. There were born to them three daughters and six sons. William Jocelyn was educated at the Charterhouse, as were four of his brothers. One brother, Thomas, after an opening career of much promise in India, died of fever in his twenty-seventh year. Another, Edward, who rose to the rank of commander in the Royal Navy, met, in his twenty-sixth year, after prolonged suffering borne with noble fortitude, a sailor's death; his ship, the 'Nautilus,' having struck near Cerigotto on a rock incorrectly laid down on the charts. He had been dearly loved by all the members of his family, and with especial tenderness by one sister, to whom William Jocelyn writes words characteristic of one who was a true son of consolation, and whose letters burn with a quiet glow:

'We can entertain no such doubt. We and our dear brother will assuredly meet again; we shall meet in joy, God knows how soon.

'The Grecian Archipelago has often been the sepulchre of the brave; a sea famous of old for the dangers of its navigation, and for the courage and conduct of those who were accustomed to sail on it' (i. 34).

William Jocelyn had himself gone to Oxford in 1796, being a contemporary at Brasenose of Richard and Reginald Heber, to whom he was introduced by his schoolfellow,

Richard Henry Roundell, the Roundell and Heber families belonging to the same village, Gledstone, in the Craven district of the West Riding of Yorkshire. After a genial and honourable career in the university, not marked by the special distinctions which were to await his sons there, he was ordained, and in 1802 presented by Bishop Horsley to the rectory of Mixbury, in Oxfordshire, near the Buckinghamshire border and the town of Buckingham. For four years he spent most of his time at St. Asaph as his uncle's chaplain; but from 1806 till his death in 1853, Mixbury, with which, from 1814, he held the adjoining living of Finmere, was his home. In 1810 he married Dorothea Roundell, sister of his old school and college friend. Six sons were born—William, the eldest, in 1811; Roundell, on November 27, 1812; Edwin, the youngest, in 1824—and five daughters.

'To those who had not learnt to love it, there could be little attraction in Mixbury' (i. 51). Yet it is with a loving hand that Lord Selborne traces the features of his early home in the Midlands: the one street of stone-built thatched cottages, lying at the extreme north-east angle of the high and bleak tableland of Oxfordshire, the soil of coarse marly limestone, little wood but hedgerow timber, no water save a tiny tributary of the Bedfordshire Ouse. Finmere had greater pretensions, in part owing to its neighbourhood to Stowe, and the grounds of its rectory had been laid out by 'Capability' Brown. Mr. Palmer was a lover and a quiet observer of nature; he taught his children to watch the habits of birds and animals, and would show them in his telescope the moon and the planets. Botany and entomology they added from elsewhere; and the list of Mixbury plants and animals, recorded for their beauty rather than their rarity, is the first evidence of a taste which enriched and relieved a life of engrossing work, and which suggested the dedication to Lord Selborne of the beautiful edition of White's 'Selborne' published in 1877.¹ When the first break in the family circle was made by the death of his son Tom, a boy of nine, Mr. Palmer caused to be engraved above two simple lines of inscription upon his tomb 'emblems of mortality and immortality suggested by our fondness for the study of insect life—the caterpillar, chrysalis, and perfect fly of the beautiful Ocellated Hawk Moth' (i. 71).

It has been said of the English Church of the days before the Reform Bill that 'its beauty was its family life of purity

¹ White's *Selborne*, ed. T. Bell (John van Oorst, 1877).

and sim
of the
each br
brother
volume
might
English
better
often t
depth o
between
the fath
this too
and, on
pursuits
pastora
element
time, h
rubrica
more a
thought
by its c
than do
his son
priest is
we say,

'I ha
souls we
clergyma
position
worthily
But what
six hund
no one e
distincti
tent with
and willi
and frien
a way wh
old, who
duct he c
a man of
warm an
individua

VOL.

and simplicity ; its blot was quiet worldliness.¹ Of the beauty of the life which centred in Mixbury, the eager interest of each brother in the career and conduct and character of his brothers, and of the father in each and all, no reader of these volumes can be unaware ; if, as we believe to be the case, it might be matched in the unrecorded annals of many an English parsonage in the first quarter of this century, the better for the English Church. What we cannot expect often to find is the loftiness of tone, and the serenity and depth of intellectual life, which illuminate all which passes between father and sons on the great questions ; and it is in the father's character, a most unselfish and profound one, that this took its origin. Mr. Palmer was a county magistrate, and, on occasion, a shrewd and useful one ; he loved country pursuits, and was a keen fisherman. But neither in his pastoral life nor in his correspondence is any alien or jarring element discerned. In church he was in advance of his time, both as to reverence in ministration and as to rubrical strictness ; and was prompt in meeting the need for more and fuller services as it arose. His preaching was thoughtful, but not ambitious ; and his reading of Scripture, by its combined dignity and reverence, taught more lessons than do many sermons. On his pastoral life out of church his son must speak ; if the picture which he draws of the parish priest is in some sense representative and not unique, again we say, the better for the English Church.

'I have heard some people speak as if the care of a few hundred souls were insufficient employment for the zeal and energy of a clergyman of mark. My father did not think so. There was no position in the Church which he could not (in my belief) have worthily filled, which he might not have ennobled and adorned. But what God had charged him with was the care of those five or six hundred people at Mixbury and Finmere, for whom there was no one else to care, among whom there was no praise to be won, no distinction to be attained, no ambition to be gratified. He was content with this, and sought for nothing more. These people he loved and willingly served, wisely also and discreetly, as a spiritual father and friend, who understood them, and was able to speak to them in a way which they could understand. There was not one, young or old, whom he did not personally know, or whose character and conduct he did not observe and study. He was not demonstrative, nor a man of many words ; he kept his feelings, which were naturally warm and strong, quite under command. . . . His interest in individuals was not capricious or transitory, but patient and per-

¹ *The Oxford Movement*, R. W. Church, p. 3.

severing. It was long before he despaired (if he did ever despair) even of those who went astray' (i. 58).

We note, in proof of this kindly discrimination and knowledge of individuals, that, when Mr. Roundell Palmer's success at the Bar first made it necessary to engage a regular clerk, the right person was found in his father's service at Mixbury, who was, till his own death, 'clerk, cashier, bookkeeper, and faithful friend to his employer.' And when, in 1844, a second clerk had to be added, a Finnere man, recommended by Mr. Palmer, was chosen, who became afterwards chief clerk to Lord Hobhouse, and rose to an important post in the public service.

The remarkable character and the somewhat strange wandering among the Churches of Mr. William Palmer, Lord Selborne's eldest brother, occupy many pages in these Memorials; and the lives of his father and brother were much affected by his. His visit to Russia in 1840-1, described by himself in a volume edited by Cardinal Newman in 1882, a second visit made in 1842-3, a journey to Constantinople in 1851-2, and the circumstances which finally led to his reception, in 1855, into the Roman Communion, are set out by Lord Selborne, with whom, as well as with their father, Mr. William Palmer had corresponded largely on the question of Churches, and on kindred subjects, with minute and affectionate care.

To a man of the elder Mr. William Palmer's mind, satisfied of the essential soundness of the Anglican position, and disposed to stand upon the ancient ways, yet of profoundly sympathetic nature, and accessible to all which could be urged for the amendment of his Church, the prolonged examination by his eldest son of his inherited Anglican tradition, followed by a widening divergence from it, must have been a cause of much distress. It is nothing less than wonderful to follow the long correspondence, and mark the affection shown on both sides, the unflinching meekness and the dauntless strength of conviction on that of the father. We can only give two short examples. On April 22, 1843, he writes:

'But what is it you say about not denying the merit of those who take a part of the Church for the whole? Is not every article of the Creed, in its totality and perfection, a mystery above us? Are we capable of comprehending *the Whole*? And must not our part be, in a manner, *the Whole to us*? There was a certain detestable school of philosophy in our own days, which taught that a man should consider himself as a citizen of the world—which is true; but it was a sort of *Corban*, for it was intended to discharge him from

the duties
sider whe
is before

On M

'But

ἐπεὶ ἐπὶ
which I v
God ther
day; and
I have d
not there
but not as
to be give
allow, not
can be de
that it ma
great con
wrong, we

In 18

grave an
failing.
fifty year
Horsley
Finnere,
of thank
his son
January

'I hope
sincere de
be in the v
the knowle

We 1

Mixbury
inmates v
story of
William I
by Round
which W
up to Ox
within or
Wincheste
prepared
of a robu
exact one,
school-life

the duties that belong to one's own country and kin. Let us consider whether this be not somewhat analogous to the question that is before us now' (i. 412).

On March 2, 1846:

'But I will endeavour yet to imitate one who *παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἀπὸς ἐπίστευεν*. This is my "name's day"; that is, the day on which I was baptized; and that I was indeed baptized, I thank my God there cannot possibly be a reasonable doubt. This was the day; and, to this day, while with shame and grief I confess that I have deserved judgment, mercy alone has awaited me. I will not therefore doubt, nor ever cease to hope, in your own words, but not as you apply them, that, if anything you now hold is (*i.e.* ought) to be given up, in due time you will find the way. Only think and allow, not that the faith can be wrong, not that duty to the Church can be doubtful, but that man's apprehension of it *must* be imperfect, that it *may* be often wrong, our own *may* be, and not the less for our great confidence in holding it; but which, as soon as we see it to be wrong, we should desire and try to amend' (i. 431).

In 1852 Mr. Palmer felt that his health, which had caused grave anxiety to his family just fifteen years before, was now failing. He resigned Mixbury, after an incumbency of nearly fifty years; and it was a great happiness to him that his son Horsley was appointed to be his successor. He retired to Finmere, and there, on September 27, 1853, passed away full of thankfulness and charity. His last communication with his son William about the Roman controversy, written on January 5, 1853, ends thus:

'I hope in *this* we entirely agree, and ever shall—namely, a sincere desire to be set right in everything where, unhappily, we may be in the wrong, and to be found still advancing and progressing in the knowledge of Truth' (ii. 154).

We have now seen something of the family life in Mixbury Rectory, and of the relations maintained among its inmates when they went out into the world. We take up the story of the author's life from his schooldays. When William Palmer went to Rugby, in 1823, he was accompanied by Roundell. Both boys were together for two years, after which William stayed one more, and then, at fifteen, went up to Oxford as a Demy of Magdalen; Roundell, who was within one place of him in the school, was removed to Winchester. The thoroughness with which they had been prepared for school-work by their father, who was a scholar of a robust and tasteful type, if not, in the technical sense, an exact one, is made abundantly clear. That, in preparation for school-life and its trials, Mr. Palmer was not less wise and care-

ful will be seen from the very touching letters written by him to Henry, the son afterwards lost at sea (i. 167). Yet, even so, the plunge into the turmoil of a public school must have been a severe one. The boy did not like leaving Rugby, and after taking his degree he had the piety to visit it, staying with Arnold, to whom he had been introduced by Walter Ker Hamilton. Some of his early impressions had to be corrected; thus, in some lines addressed to Dr. Wooll, then on a visit to the Warden of Winchester, he had spoken of the 'rutilas Rugbeiaë arces, frontemque minacem,' which found no counterpart in the real Rugby revisited (i. 156).

In June 1825 Roundell Palmer went to Winchester as a candidate for a scholarship. This was, in those days, matter of simple nomination, and his nomination was not of a kind to give him a real chance of election; in the autumn of that year he entered the school as a commoner. His home and Rugby training carried him at once into the highest part of the school accessible to a new boy, a sheltered corner, which no fagging reached, and where there was no changing of places. He remained at school till 1830, when he was 'Senior Prefect in Commoners.' But in heart he was a Winchester boy till the day of his death; eagerly taking every opportunity of visiting and keeping up his knowledge of the place; and repaying, not only by affection, but by gifts of solid time and mental power, his debt to the school, and to the large-hearted men who administered it in his early days.

Wykehamists will perhaps nowhere find a more charming picture of the hills and chalk-streams and buildings which they love than is drawn by Lord Selborne from his first boyish impressions. Of the cathedral, and of the effect on his mind of his first attendance in 'this glorious building,' as though he 'had received the gift of a new sense,' he speaks with special warmth. This splendid vision was, indeed, with him through life. In lines written by him in 1843 for the four hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Winchester College, which were approved by William Wordsworth and by Keble, and were translated into Greek by Charles Wordsworth, he writes of the cathedral, the college, and the hospital of St. Cross:

'The huge Cathedral sleeping in venerable gloom,
The modest College tower, and the bedesmen's Norman home.'
(i. 362).

Fifty years later, when the five hundredth anniversary of the college was celebrated, he writes of William of Wykeham that 'his transformation of the nave of Winchester Cathedral

from the
wonderful
judgment

Win-
Williams
hearted
Roundell
common
in the h
being kn
were rep
the boar
more nu
most pur
was a re
and the
schools,
acutely t
a whimsi
kindly i
depende
capacity
system w
are comb
force is v
amiable
awkward,
lacking
émeute an
a rude sh
effects.

Among
whose fri
William C
Edward T
and 'one
speculativ
prevented
promised,

In 183
before leav
one of thr
standing g

¹ 'Wykel
College, 1397

from the Norman to the Earlier Perpendicular style is a wonderful performance, which, if I might trust my own judgment, I should place above all the rest.'¹

Winchester was then under the genial rule of Dr. David Williams, afterwards Warden of New College, a warm-hearted man and excellent scholar, with whom in later years Roundell Palmer kept up an intimate friendship. The 130 commoners of those days were, in theory at least, boarders in the headmaster's house, the buildings occupied by them being known as 'Old Commoners,' which, under Dr. Moberly, were replaced by 'New Commoners,' in turn superseded by the boarding-houses in which the commoners, now much more numerous, are lodged. The society, which was for most purposes entirely distinct from the seventy college boys, was a remarkable one for the intensity of its corporate life and the completeness of its self-government. Like other schools, but possibly in greater degree than any, it was acutely tenacious of old customs, even to its own hurt; and a whimsical instance of this spirit defeating Dr. Williams's kindly intentions is chronicled. The good government depended in very large measure on the character and capacity of the eight prefects. It is evident that such a system works under difficulties unless intellectual qualities are combined with energy and moral courage, while physical force is very desirable in reserve. William George Ward—amiable and good-humoured, but eccentric and somewhat awkward, and not fitted by nature to command, though not lacking bodily force—being senior prefect, produced an *émeute* among the governed classes, or 'Inferiors,' which gave a rude shock to the social fabric, and was long-lasting in its effects.

Among the more eminent of the Winchester schoolfellows whose friendship he retained at Oxford and in after-life were William George Ward, Robert Lowe, and Edward Cardwell. Edward Twistleton, afterwards highly distinguished at Oxford and 'one of the most accomplished men of his time,' whose speculative and introspective turn of mind seems to have prevented him from wholly realizing what his early life had promised, had preceded him by a few years.

In 1830 he entered as a commoner at Christ Church; but before leaving school was elected to a scholarship at Trinity, one of three colleges whose scholarships were then open, and standing then, as now, in the forefront of the Oxford

¹ 'Wykeham's Place in History,' by the Earl of Selborne, in *Winchester College, 1393-1893* (Edward Arnold, 1893).

colleges. Among the tutors were Thomas Short, a link between countless generations of Oxford men, and Isaac Williams. Dear as Winchester had been, the removal to Oxford was in every sense an expansion; and few men have had a more delightful undergraduate life on which to look back. To the friends who preceded or followed him from school were added those who had been his brother's friends—Charles Wordsworth, Thomas Leigh Claughton, and John Thomas. The introduction to Charles Wordsworth is characteristic of both men:

'He took a fancy to me partly because he saw me once, in broad daylight and in the High Street, carrying a basketful of wild plants which I had been collecting at Shotover—so small are the occasions which sometimes lead to useful results. This disregard of the conventionalities of time and place pleased him, and his approval confirmed me in the habit of doing for myself, when convenient, things which some people think beneath their dignity—a habit learnt at Winchester which was perhaps among the best fruits of the rougher part of my training there' (i. 124).

Charles Wordsworth's consummate scholarship, of which a worthy specimen is given in some beautiful lines from his prize poem on Mexico, made a profound impression upon his friend, and his conversation on the poetry of his uncle, and on Scott, Southey, and Coleridge, is remembered for its animating force and for the pure pleasure of it. Claughton, a lifelong and most tender friend, was a scholar too, and a lover of poetry, not without a poetical gift of his own; he learned from, or with, his younger fellow-scholar of Trinity the 'purifying' charm of Wordsworth's poetry, and first taught him to see the beauties contained in Tennyson's earliest volumes (i. 122). John Thomas, lively, affectionate, yet fastidious and severely self-critical, settled afterwards into a quiet career quite other than what his friends would have forecast for him. His friendship, too, lasted into riper years, and its helpfulness is warmly acknowledged (i. 124).

To these were soon added other friends. The 'Union, then at its best, brings before us a cloud of great names—Sidney Herbert, Henry Edward Manning, Frederic Rogers, Frederick Denison Maurice. William Ewart Gladstone, 'prince of the Etonians of his time, and at the head of the literary society of his house,' was president, and as pre-eminent then as since (i. 128). Then came younger men, as John Wickens, George Mellish, Frederic William Faber. With Faber the friendship was an enthusiasm fed on a common devotion to the favourite poets of each:

'I
worth'
me to
the Bi
and la
pany,
langua
everyth
ness of
the con
insight
seemed
schools
the *In*
natural
unders

Th
the w
moods
but hi
end.

In
Class,
Englis
for La
years
the sa
Magda
tion, fi
William
Faber.
Robert
remem
Church
Eastw
Priory
the Ea
study i
'dry be
of one
philoso

'Th
the hun
on a G
somethi
ages we
that eve

'It is from this time that I date the practical influence of Wordsworth's poetry upon my mind, though his nephew had introduced me to it, and taught me to admire it. I know no reading (except the Bible) of which the influence upon myself has been so profound and lasting. From Wordsworth I learnt, in Frederic Faber's company, large human sympathies. Wordsworth interpreted to me the language of nature, as speaking to the heart of man; the beauty of everything real and true, the Divine voice everywhere, the worthlessness of whatever is artificial and conventional, in comparison with the common bond and the common heritage of mankind. In his insight into the harmonies of things, natural and revealed religion seemed to bear witness to each other. The dogmatists of the schools might find Pantheism in *Tintern Abbey*, and call in question the *Intimations of Immortality* as to the Divine illumination of the natural human soul. Those who so judged did not seem to me to understand either the poet or the man' (i. 136).

This happy friendship never varied as to affection, for all the waywardness of Faber's nature in its quickly passing moods of attraction and repulsion towards views and persons; but his change of Church brought personal intercourse to an end. His elder brother Frank was a lifelong friend.

In 1834 Roundell Palmer took his degree in the First Class, having won the Ireland Scholarship and the prizes for English and Latin verse, to which he afterwards added that for Latin essay. The English essay he lost in successive years to James Mozley and Henry Halford Vaughan. In the same year he became Eldon Scholar and Fellow of Magdalen, in which college he resided for his year of probation, finding there in residence several friends of his brother William, who had himself gone to Durham, among them Frank Faber. He took private pupils, one of whom was John Robert Godley, a Harrow man and an Irishman, to be especially remembered for the noble enterprise of the foundation of Christ Church, New Zealand. The Long Vacation of 1834 he spent at Eastwell Park, near Rugby, and that of 1835 at Haverholme Priory in Lincolnshire, as tutor to Lord Maidstone, son of the Earl of Winchilsea, and in the latter year began legal study in the chambers of Mr. Walters, a conveyancer. The 'dry bones' of conveyancing were at first little to the taste of one fresh from the 'flowers of history, poetry, and philosophy.' Henry Halford Vaughan wrote to reassure him:

'There is a real beauty, though often a latent one, in whatever the human mind creates upon necessity. It is impossible to look on a Gothic building without feeling this. It was only meant for something strong that would keep out a bad climate, and how many ages were men in finding out its exceeding beauty! So I believe that even in a *deed* there is a *τὸ καλόν*' (i. 200).

Lord Selborne speaks of the art in well-weighed words :

'I never was fascinated by the beauties of conveyancing. I did, however, learn to appreciate in that art a certain symmetry and completeness, not unworthy of admiration. As mathematics is thought by many to be the best practice of logic, so the conveyancing of that day was as good practice as could well be imagined in the exact (however formal and technical) use of language. It did not affect conciseness or object to a multiplicity of words where a few might have seemed more apt to express an intelligible meaning. But to be popularly intelligible was no part of the draughtsman's aim. It was, for his purpose, better and safer that he should be understood by the initiated, and interpreted by them to the world at large. The words, though many, had meaning; and they were so put together as to leave nothing elliptical, nothing to be supplied by inference, nothing dependent on punctuation. It would, of course, have been the destruction of all style to apply this method to any other kind of composition; but I have found benefit through life, for all the purposes of writing and criticism and interpretation of documents, from what I learnt in Mr. Walters's chambers' (i. 201).

After a year spent in the more congenial atmosphere of an equity draughtsman's chambers, Roundell Palmer was called to the Bar on June 7, 1837. His first real opening came in 1839, when a brief, bearing the auspicious name of Freshfields, brought him into court, as junior counsel for the defence, in a case on the equity side of the Court of Exchequer (i. 247.) Mr. Palmer took a point which had not been pressed by his leaders, and in which he saw a sufficient defence to the plaintiff's motion. Words of commendation were written by Baron Alderson to Mr. James Freshfield, and by him passed on with interest to Mr. James Horsley. In 1839 'the Rubicon of 100*l*.' was passed; in 1843 a move was made from the first chambers on the Chapel staircase of Lincoln's Inn to a larger set, in 11 New Square; in 1844 a second clerk was required; and a silk gown came into view in a not very distant future. The judges and leading counsel of the old Chancery Bar formed a society, almost a family, of men, quick and powerful in intellect, profoundly conscious of the strong and weak points of one another, with vigorous mutual likes and dislikes, yet for the most part extraordinarily generous and forbearing, so far as the interests of clients allowed. Lord Selborne passes before us in brief and brilliant review many great names—those of Lord Cottenham and Baron Alderson, who stood pre-eminent among the judges in his early days; Lord Langdale, Vice-Chancellors Leach and Shadwell, Campbell, Pollock, Knight Bruce, Romilly, Page Wood,

Bethel,
to stan
Attorne
was the
ties of
the mis
most int
His pro
words s
M. Bern
Hall of

'I re
calling—
underval
and liber
lege to s
by laying
on every
miserable
question
great, in
which we
I venture
guished.
(ii. 472).

Cole
part of I
or meta
all his
truth a
Rounde
later ac
of ment
terbalan
specially
among
heart, a
all sides
projecte
ranged
spent w
that rem
in Lond
and phi

¹ *Tab*

Bethell, and many others. It was his lot at a later time to stand by Lord Westbury in his fall; how loyal the Attorney-General was to his chief, and how discriminating was the estimate which he had formed of the great qualities of mind and character of that remarkable man, and of the misfortunes or foibles which marred them, is set out in a most interesting chapter at the end of these Memorials (ii. 487). His profession he loved for its own sake, and the glowing words spoken by him in 1864 as Attorney-General, when M. Berryer was entertained by the Bar of England, in the Hall of the Middle Temple, expresses his lifelong feeling:

'I rejoice in seeing around me so many gentlemen of our noble calling—a calling which vulgar minds frequently misrepresent and undervalue, but upon which in no small degree depend the rights and liberties both of individuals and of nations. It is its high privilege to supply the fair weights and balances of the scales of justice, by laying before justice all the considerations which ought to weigh on every side of every question—to stand forward for the weak and miserable, and, upon great occasions when public liberties are in question, to assert undauntedly the public right. There are three great, inestimable blessings which we in this country enjoy, and which we should be glad to see all the rest of the world enjoy; and I venture to say that where they exist, public liberty cannot be extinguished. They are a free Press, a free Parliament, and a free Bar' (ii. 472).

Coleridge has said¹ that an advocate ought to devote a part of his time to 'some study of the metaphysics of the mind or metaphysics of theology; something which shall call forth all his powers, and centre his wishes in the investigation of truth alone, without reference to a side to be supported.' Roundell Palmer's years from 1832 to 1843, including his later academical and early professional life, were years full of mental activity, and rich in the storing-up of such counterbalancing resources. As an undergraduate he had felt specially drawn to Plato, Herodotus, and Demosthenes among the ancients. Herodotus he had learned almost by heart, and had collected illustrations of his writings from all sides. During his year of residence in Magdalen he projected a collection of the Hellenic myths, to be arranged upon a philosophical basis. In the Long Vacation spent with Lord Maidstone, he read through carefully all that remains of Livy and Polybius. After beginning study in London, he read largely in Rousseau, of whose power and philosophical influence he formed a very high opinion;

¹ *Table Talk*, October 27, 1831, p. 142 (London: Murray, 1836).

he took up Plato anew, and first read the *Republic*; he read Milton in his entirety. Carlyle he attempted; but we are not surprised to hear that neither the style, in spite of its splendid pictorial and dramatic power, nor the substance satisfied a mind so formed. Words used in a lecture given to his constituents at Plymouth in 1852 on 'The Connexion of Poetry with History,'¹ may serve to show how his intellectual character was built upon these great authors, and how they had attracted or repelled him:

'Wordsworth, whom I believe the greatest and most truthful poetical thinker of his generation, has done far more than any other man to neutralize the poison of Rousseau's system, and to extract what is good from it, leaving the evil behind. He is a poet conscious of a great vocation; whose works (to use a metaphor of his own) are an intellectual temple dedicated to God as seen in Nature, and in the power, variety, beauty, and sacredness of human feeling. The whole office and object of his poetry is to harmonize the philosophy of sentiment with natural religion—not opposing natural religion to the Christian scheme (the truth and exclusive sufficiency of which he never fails to recognize), but appealing to the voice of God in His works, as one, in its moral meaning, admonitions, and tendencies, with the voice in His Word.'

There were other literary interests of a more ephemeral kind. A review of Charles Wordsworth's Greek Grammar in the *British Critic* led to other contributions, and to a study of the Turkish question, taken up, on the suggestion of Dr. Newman, with a view to an article. The article was never written, but the study, as we see a few years later, was not wasted. Then came a connexion with Printing House Square, which lasted three years, 1840-3, and came to an end partly in consequence of a note of warning raised from Mixbury. Mr. Palmer writes to his son in 1841:

'After all, I would have you even consider whether (all things considered) it would not be more prudent to give up altogether an engagement so fascinating and intrusive, with so many plausible reasons to recommend it, and withal so lucrative; but which may in the end involve you in politics before the time, and in such a way as to make you less able to render service to the cause of good government, virtue, and religion hereafter, should it please God ever to require your services as a public man in the regular way of your calling; which alone I think we should consider *His*. Do not misunderstand me, as absolutely advising or suggesting that the connexion with the *Times* should be given up—but only *considered*' (i. 307).

Academical subjects claimed no small share in his

¹ London: Whittaker, 1852.

ener
Basi
disti
and
Lor
his
upon
statu
from
a cl
gati
of a
to c
scien
give
of th
of t
men
in 1
refor
grow
whe
the
of th
to g
emo
wind
gene
V
drew
toget
moth
nobl
In 1
ther
early
Linc
wor
the
reca
he a
the
were
year
M

energies. He examined for the 'Ireland' at Oxford when Basil Jones was scholar, and Frederic Temple a highly distinguished candidate, and for scholarships at Harrow and at Winchester. He was regular in his attendance at Lord's during the week of the public school matches. In his own college questions arose as to the obligation laid upon the Fellows by their oath to observe the founder's statutes, and to refrain from inviting interference with them from external authority. The answer is given by him with a clearness and cogency all his own (i. 228). No obligation can be absolute which conflicts with the enactments of a higher authority, and no oath can be taken as intended to create such an obligation. On the other hand, conscience required that in all other cases effect should be given to the founder's provisions (as in the superannuation of the 'demies' at the proper time). It forbade a member of the foundation from inviting the interference of Parliament, and on this principle Roundell Palmer strictly acted in 1848, when friends pressed him to lead the cause of Oxford reform in the House of Commons (ii. 197). The rapid growth of his professional income now made him doubt whether he was doing right in keeping his fellowship; while the uncertainties of health and of practice, especially in view of the impending change to a silk gown, made him hesitate to give it up. The question was settled by his returning the emoluments while retaining the position, and the beautiful windows in the chapel of Magdalen are the fruits of his generosity.

Various family troubles occurring during this period drew the hearts of the Mixbury family still more closely together. First came the long disabling illness of the mother, which brought clearly out before his son's eyes the noble unselfishness and unfailing fortitude of Mr. Palmer. In 1838 Edwin Palmer, then a boy of fourteen at Charterhouse, had a severe and protracted illness, during the early stages of which he was under his brother's care in Lincoln's Inn. At the end of the same year Mr. Palmer, worn out by fatigue and anxiety, broke a bloodvessel in the lungs, and his life was despaired of. Lord Selborne recalls how, in the Mixbury study, with overflowing hearts, he and his brother William read the story of Hezekiah in the lesson of the day, and how two days afterwards they were allowed to hope, and how a term of all but fifteen years was added to their father's days.

Meanwhile another great sorrow had befallen the family

in the loss at sea of Henry, the brother next to Roundell. Henry was no scholar like his brothers; and this disadvantage had called out an especially tender feeling on his father's part. He left Rugby at fourteen, in 1830, and made two voyages to India and China, after which he sailed in 1833 in the 'Elizabeth,' an ill-found vessel, which made the voyage to China in safety, and then left on her homeward way for Canada to take in a cargo of timber. She was last heard of in the St. Lawrence on November 25, but it was not till August of the following year that hope was given up. Writing in 1870 to Sir Arthur Gordon, then mourning under a long-continued uncertainty on his nephew's behalf, just sadly ended, Sir Roundell Palmer thus refers to this time of suspense:

'It brings back to my mind the most painful (in some respects) of all my own early recollections, when I lost a brother at sea, whose fate was for many months uncertain, and was never cleared up by any positive intelligence. My father's long and patient suffering at that time is vividly impressed upon my memory; and I am therefore not wholly unable to understand what Lady Aberdeen has had to go through' (i. 183).

If there were family troubles, there came to him in those days, through his younger brothers, Horsley and Edwin, 'the purest and most purifying of all my pleasures in those days' (i. 233). Edwin had gone to Charterhouse in 1836, and Horsley, who was two years older, followed him there a year later. The boys used to spend their Saturdays and Sundays with their brother, who entered into all their school interests and admitted them to his own. In the stress of professional work he kept up a correspondence with Edwin on Latin verse and entomology; and in 1839 we hear of a tour made in the southern counties and in France, with 'health and entomology' for its objects (i. 250). The many who knew the most lovable character of Archdeacon Palmer will understand what happiness was brought to Mixbury, a year or two later, by his brilliant career at Oxford. 'His successes,' writes Lord Selborne, 'and the way in which he took them, were to us all like intervals of warm sunshine in a stormy day; to none more so than to myself' (ii. 41). Some also—alas! comparatively few—will welcome the notice of a friend brought by Edwin to Mixbury in 1845, of whom he writes to his brother as 'noble, earnest, thoughtful, without a spark of selfishness, full of high, deep feeling, and with no little intellectual enthusiasm' (i. 390.) This was James Riddell, 'the finest scholar of his day in Balliol,' and, we may add with confidence, in Oxford, too

early
hood.
T
joys
and c
trial.
tranq
was p
few.
about
theolo
joined
Fathe
leisur
recor
must
now
father
symp
that v
chara
opini
his li
strong
(i. 310
broug
delive
as ex
Chris
the J
subje
Palme
him a
cedur
qualif
than
Natur
as qu
when
Roun
Bar,
Mr. P
and
the r
surely

early taken from Oxford by death in the flower of his manhood.

Through all the business and occupations and sorrows and joys of these years there was a steady growth of character and of religious conviction, not without its times of stress and trial. The years of early life in Oxford had been a time of tranquillity in the atmosphere of the place. Mr. Newman was preaching at St. Mary's, but his spell had only bound a few. Undergraduates read their books, and did not cast about for the true Church. In the first years of London life, theological interests became more potent. Roundell Palmer joined a small society formed for the study of the Early Fathers, but retired from the undertaking as too vast for his leisure, and not likely to be satisfactory in its results. He records words ascribed to Bishop Horsley, that 'the Fathers must be read with caution' (i. 210). Threelines of influence were now determining his mental progress—the teaching of his father, deeply spiritual, but sober and distrustful of emotion; sympathy with his brother William in his revolt against all that was narrow and insular; and the piety and beauty of character of his many friends of so called 'Evangelical' opinion. The first and third of these forces were to the end of his life present and operative; the influence of his brother was stronger at this period than at any other time before or after (i. 310). We find the brothers acting together in a matter which brought them both into prominence when, in 1840, William delivered his attack upon the 'Society system' in the Church as exemplified in the conduct of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The elder brother's protest against the Jerusalem Bishopric scheme in the following year was the subject of a prolonged correspondence between himself, Mr. Palmer, and Roundell, the two latter being in agreement with him as to principle, but not in all points of detail and of procedure. William Palmer's treatise on the Articles had the qualified approval of his brother—a less qualified approval than he would have accorded to it in later life (i. 310). Naturally, there was inward struggle in these years, as well as quiet growth. Two indications must suffice. In 1835, when the family had just given up hope for Henry, Roundell Palmer proposed to his father to abandon the Bar, with its dangers and ambitions, for Holy Orders. Mr. Palmer met the question with his usual gentle wisdom, and no more was heard of it (i. 177). We cannot regret the result; for, faithful and able as Roundell Palmer would surely have been in any part of the ordained ministry of

the Church, it was reserved for him, as for Sir Thomas More and other great men who have felt the same drawing in their youth, to show the world the character of a Christian layman; not an ecclesiastic without orders, but a layman who knows what is due to spiritual powers and persons. In 1845 came a crisis even more deeply inward (i. 391). How it came and passed another biographer would not have dared to tell, and we will not try to do so; enough that the result was a clearing-up and strengthening of the inner life, and a consciousness that for those chosen children of Nature, as he had learned to understand Wordsworth's 'Nature,' to whom she is herself 'Law and Impulse,' helps are held out by unseen hands, in all things about them, even where least expected.

In 1847 Roundell Palmer's parliamentary life began. His old interest in politics had been quickened by intercourse with Godley, his Oxford pupil and friend, and with Goldwin Smith; but the impulse came from Cardwell, member for Clitheroe, and an adherent of Sir Robert Peel. After a journey of discovery to Canterbury, undertaken without result, the opportunity arose at Plymouth, on the invitation of Dr. Yonge. The attempt ended with his return, by a good majority over his immediate antagonist, and a cost to himself of only 600*l.*; and he entered the House of Commons as a Conservative of Sir Robert Peel's following. Three points came into prominence in his political professions. One was resistance to the repeal of the Navigation Laws, in which Plymouth was much concerned; on this, though he voted for the repeal, further inquiry changed his opinion. On the two others, the maintenance of the Established Church, and equality of civil and religious liberty, he never wavered. The latter principle was soon brought to the test upon the practical question of the admission of Jews to Parliament. To his constituents the candidate declined to pledge himself, only promising serious attention to the subject; in the House, somewhat in opposition to the cautious counsels of his father, he both spoke and voted for the measure.

In the early days of the following year he married Lady Laura Waldegrave, with whose family he had been intimate for several years past, at first through her brother Samuel, afterwards Bishop of Carlisle. Marriage enriched his life a thousandfold, both through the domestic happiness, increasing and unbroken for many long years, which followed it, and also through the connexion thus enlarged with a school of religious opinion different from that in which he had

himself
seen, v

Th
one of
fidence
1852-
Lord
second
resigna
till 18
Riding
Woolst

Am
for Ply
which,
strain v
writes:

'I th
interests
interfere
law, the
(i. 464).

Rou
wide to
these h
We wil
the head
out of l

In m
Herefor
Church
mony o
Court o
which l
Justices
were fo
Lord D
firmatio
only to
defende
to the
would b
Crown p
the conf
into the

himself grown up, yet presenting a side which, as we have seen, was in some respects very congenial to him.

The connexion with Plymouth, which was, on the whole, one of honourable independence on the one side and of confidence on the other, lasted, with a break of nearly a year in 1852-3, till 1857; when, in consequence of his resistance to Lord Palmerston's high-handed policy in the matter of the second Chinese War, he anticipated an adverse vote by resignation. He did not come back to the House of Commons till 1860, being then returned for Richmond in the North Riding, for which borough he sat until his elevation to the Woolsack in 1872.

Among the letters of congratulation on the first election for Plymouth was one from Sir John Taylor Coleridge, in which, after warning the new member of the danger of overstrain which House of Commons work brings to a lawyer, he writes:

'I think the lawyer in Parliament, after due attention to the local interests of his constituents, will do most good by limiting his actual interference pretty much to certain specified classes of subjects: the law, the Church, and constitutional matters seem to be his province' (i. 464).

Roundell Palmer's political interests were too real and too wide to be easily limited to any round of subjects; but upon these he was undoubtedly qualified to speak with authority. We will therefore briefly enumerate questions, coming under the heads named, which arose during the following years in or out of Parliament.

In 1847 the nomination of Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford revived an old controversy, and caused anxiety to Churchmen. An attempt to make a reality of the ceremony of confirmation ended in an even division of the Court of Queen's Bench, with the result that a *mandamus*, which had been sought for this purpose, did not issue. Justices Coleridge and Patteson, both very learned lawyers, were for granting the writ; Mr. Justice Erle, with whom Lord Denman concurred, refused, on the ground that Confirmation had reference, not to the fitness of the person, but only to the validity of the election. The decision was defended by Lord Denman in the House of Lords, in answer to the Bishop of Exeter, on the different ground that it would be against public policy, and an infringement of the Crown prerogative, as settled by the Act of Henry VIII., if the confirming authority were required or allowed to inquire into the fitness of the nominee.

Lord Selborne, whose remarks will be read with especial interest in view of recent occurrences in the church of St. Mary-le-Bow, observes that, if no investigation could follow any opposition duly raised, 'the whole ceremony must be something worse than an empty form—an unreal mockery—and the principle of law that where there was a wrong there must be a remedy would seem to be disregarded' (ii. 7); that this hardship was increased rather than diminished under the statute of Henry VIII., and that the difficulty might, and in fact did, arise when the objection was raised in another case, but under a misapprehension, on moral grounds. With regard to the legal decision, he points out that the matter was never argued with that fullness which would have been possible at a later stage, had the rule been granted, and adds—

'No case has since arisen in which a similar question has been brought into Court. If any such case should hereafter arise, the refusal of a *mandamus* by an equally divided Court in 1848 could hardly be regarded as having conclusively settled the law' (ii. 9).

On the other hand, he allows that, having been consulted in November 1847, he could contribute nothing useful towards the solution of the problem. Some suggestions were afterwards made as to invoking the authority of Parliament to control, in a sense favourable to the Church, the nominating power of the Crown; but no satisfactory proposal could be framed, and no such action was taken.¹

In the following year the question of the admission of Jews to Parliament came before the House of Commons. As we have seen, the junior member for Plymouth both spoke and voted for the measure, and the heads of his argument, carefully prepared for the debate, and accidentally preserved, show with what anxiety he had weighed the principles which determined his vote. He had first taken counsel with Dr. Moberly and his father. Dr. Moberly had allowed the arguments for the proposal to be unanswerable on abstract grounds, but doubted the wisdom of giving effect to them

¹ This is not the place in which we could adequately or appropriately discuss the vexed questions involved in what has been called the pantomime acted at St. Mary-le-Bow on December 22, 1896. Those who wish to pursue the subject further will do well to refer to Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law*, second edition, i. 36-47; *Life of the Right Rev. Samuel Wilberforce, D.D.*, by A. R. Ashwell, M.A., i. 516-8. That the original purpose of the Ceremony of Confirmation was only to identify the person elected by the Chapter is a suggestion for which, with all due respect for its author (the Bishop of Winchester), we cannot find a particle of evidence.

then
again
to his
clearly
reason
advice
question

'In
that, the
advice is

In
showed
quam
famous
many
trunche
(ii. 16).

In
sister w
cordanc
Commis
the Bill
Rounde
produc
Parliam
these M
this occ
of his f

In t
in the '
forth L
the 'Ec
weaknes
policy,
passions
member
ing up
spirited
his claim
moveme
men or

'But
of Engla
efficiency
VOL.

then and in England. The elder Mr. Palmer's opinion was against the measure on grounds of right; his practical advice to his son was not to speak or vote at all unless he could clearly make up his mind, but, if he voted at all, to give his reasons. But it was not Mr. Palmer's habit to force his advice upon his son. As he had written upon another question—one of personal advancement:

'In the advice that you have asked, and I have given, remember that, though your father, I ever was and am a weak man, and my advice is not command' (i. 390).

In the same year, the junior member for Plymouth showed that he was ready to defend civil right *tam Marte quam Minerva*, by being found on April 10, a day made famous by the threatened Chartist demonstration, 'one of the many who paraded Trafalgar Square and the Strand, truncheon in hand, in the character of a special constable' (ii. 16).

In 1849 a Bill to legalize marriage with a deceased wife's sister was first brought before the House of Commons, in accordance with the somewhat inconclusive Report of a Royal Commission. A most lucid account of the grounds on which the Bill was supported, and of the arguments by which Mr. Roundell Palmer resisted it—arguments which he often reproduced with unvarying consistency before both Houses of Parliament during the next forty years—will be found in these Memorials (ii. 24). The speech which he delivered on this occasion was printed, and received the emphatic approval of his father and of Dr. Routh.

In the year 1850, which was also marked by the judgment in the 'Gorham Case,' the so-called 'Papal aggression' called forth Lord John Russell's letter to Bishop Maltby, and led to the 'Ecclesiastical Titles Bill.' It is easy now to see the weakness in point of constitutional theory, as well as of policy, of this unfortunate measure. But at the time the passions of the country were deeply stirred, and to the member for Plymouth in particular it was a question of standing up against the *civium ardor prava jubentium*. In a spirited and outspoken letter to Dr. Yonge, he vindicates his claim to independence, repudiates any sympathy with a movement towards Rome, or any hostility to Evangelical men or doctrines, and ends:

'But if it be Tractarianism to be earnestly devoted to the Church of England, anxious to vindicate her rights and promote her spiritual efficiency; if it be Tractarianism to believe (in their natural sense and

without reservation) the doctrines expressed both in her Articles and in her Catechism and liturgical formularies, and to be well-satisfied with the Prayer-book as it stands; if it be Tractarianism to think that the mission of every true Church is from God, and not from kings or parliaments, and that doctrines of absolute prerogative, which have long been exploded in civil matters, are quite out of place in spiritual; in this sense I shall not be careful to disclaim being a Tractarian. But then I shall remember for my justification, that, in this sense, Ridley, Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, Ken, and Beveridge would also have deserved the same appellation' (ii. 76).

In another letter, written in the same month to the *Plymouth Herald* (ii. 77), he defines the true nature of the 'Royal Supremacy.'

Mr. Palmer both spoke and voted in the minority against the Bill. In consequence of this vote, and of his refusal to support the repeal of the Maynooth Grant, he was led to resign the seat in July 1852, but, as events turned out, he was again returned by the same constituency in the following year.

When, in 1850, a Royal Commission was issued to inquire into and report upon the universities, Mr. Palmer had spoken against the action of the Government, partly on the ground that such a commission would be inadequate, partly because the universities and colleges had already considerable powers, which they had not attempted to exercise. When the commission had reported, and a Bill was introduced in 1854, he intervened at two points. He moved and carried the insertion of a clause to save the rights of schools connected with particular colleges. When the question of the abolition of tests and subscriptions, so far as they disqualified Dissenters from entering the universities, was raised by Mr. Heywood, and in that limited form supported by Lord Stanley, Mr. Roundell Palmer opposed the proposal on the ground that such a concession must hereafter be pushed to its legitimate conclusion, and the universities be wholly secularised. 'I could not accept the argument that, because the universities were national, they should cease to be connected with the National Church' (ii. 203). 'I have never regretted,' he concludes, 'the part which I took in 1854' (ii. 205).

In 1856 he opposed the proposal to open the national institutions to the public on Sunday, in a speech which covered the whole ground of the authority for Sunday observance and its expediency, and which not only won the warm approval of friends and strangers, including some who thought differently from himself, but had the rare effect, as the Speaker (Denison) testifies, of changing votes and shaking the confidence of opponents (ii. 286).

Th
the In
promin
its per
heroic
of Visc
sorrow
of frien
Mr. Pa
necessi
into the
seen no
He wa
favoura
brother
upon h
(ii. 242)
help Ru
Christia
with co
on an i
rule he
races, a
Further
of Nape
mind, v
common
Coalition
willing
(i. 255).
took the
Had ch
Solicitor
practical
searching
Arthur
from ca
Aberdee
Palmerst
to remain
upon to
Any
was brou
This war
of the 'XUM

The Crimean War, by far the most stirring, if we except the Indian Mutiny, of the events of these years, occupies a prominent part in these Memorials. We hear of it first, on its personal side, in the narrative of the adventurous life and heroic death, from wounds received in the Battle of the Alma, of Viscount Chewton, Lady Laura Palmer's eldest brother. The sorrow of the family was softened by the admiring sympathy of friends and by a gracious message from the Queen; but Mr. Palmer, at least, was not satisfied as to the justice or necessity of the war. As long ago as 1840 he had examined into the Turkish question, on Dr. Newman's suggestion, and had seen no reason to differ from his correspondent's views (i. 301). He was now more familiar with Russia, and disposed to be favourable to her, owing to the kindness received by his brother William in that country, and the impressions made upon him, as a highly qualified observer, by Russian policy (ii. 242). He considered it the wisdom of the Western nations to help Russia on her way, to regard her as the natural protector of Christians within the Ottoman dominions, and to look forward with complacency to the establishment of a Russian prince on an independent throne at Constantinople. The Turkish rule he looked on as an unmixed evil for the subject Christian races, and one for which there was no prospect of a cure. Further, he profoundly distrusted the character and motives of Napoleon III. Thus the war policy was little to his mind, whether in its origin, development, or results. In common with Peel's other followers, he had supported the Coalition Government. When it fell, Lord Aberdeen was willing that his friends should serve under Lord Palmerston (i. 255). The experiment was tried, and failed, and the Peelites took their position under the gangway on the Ministerial side. Had changes among the law officers led to the offer of the Solicitor-Generalship to Mr. Roundell Palmer, a difficult practical question would have had to be faced. With many searchings of heart, he consulted his friends Cardwell and Arthur Gordon. The latter was inclined to dissuade him from casting in his lot with Lord Palmerston; Lord Aberdeen's followers might most naturally turn to Lord Palmerston, yet the foreign policy of the latter was likely to remain unsatisfactory, and a law officer might be called upon to defend acts which he disapproved (i. 302).

Any idea of immediate co-operation with Lord Palmerston was brought to an end by the second Chinese War, in 1857. This war arose out of the seizure by the Chinese Government of the 'Arrow,' a vessel engaged in the contraband opium

trade, manned by Chinamen, but carrying British colours. Sir John Bowring, Governor of Hong Kong, having failed to obtain redress, proceeded to the bombardment of Canton, and his act was upheld by Lord Palmerston. Mr. Palmer, who had some years before been employed professionally to draft a statement of the case of the opium merchants, had formed an opinion that the suppression of a contraband trade was not a just cause of war; he had also satisfied himself that the 'Arrow' was not a vessel protected by the treaties then in force. Thus, when in March 1857 Mr. Cobden moved a vote of censure on Sir John Bowring, Mr. Palmer took part against the Government, answering the technical arguments of Sir R. Bethell, the Attorney-General. The Government was defeated by a majority of nineteen, Lord Palmerston dissolved, and public feeling ran so high in the country, and in particular at Plymouth, that Mr. Palmer was advised not to seek re-election. He took leave of his constituents, and was without a seat until 1861. In that year, in the course of the changes consequent on Lord Campbell's death, the office of Solicitor-General was offered to him and accepted.

'My interview with the Prime Minister lasted no more than five minutes: I stipulated that I was to be free on the Church-rate and Wife's Sister questions, to which he readily agreed; and he told me that a seat would be found for me in Parliament' (ii. 367).

This was Richmond in Yorkshire, 'the most picturesque spot in the North of England,' as the Speaker (Denison) described it, whose beauty was enhanced by the association of the borough with Lord Zetland, 'the model of an English gentleman' (ii. 368).

For five years Sir Roundell Palmer acted as a law officer; first as Solicitor-General, with Sir W. Atherton; then, on the retirement of the latter in 1863, as Attorney-General, with Sir R. Collier as Solicitor. The Queen's Advocate during this time was first Sir John Harding, afterwards Sir Robert Phillimore.

Perhaps no more momentous questions were ever submitted to law officers than those which arose out of the American War. The seizure by Captain Wilkes of Messrs. Mason and Slidell, Confederate envoys, from the 'Trent,' an English mail steamer, and the cases of the 'Florida,' 'Alabama,' and 'Alexandra,' are only some of the most famous of these incidents; which required unwearied vigilance on the part of the legal advisers of the Government, and imposed on them the duty of justifying its action, both in

the H
to enj
which
the a
innoc
escape
of rom
assiste
for Sir
the du
of law
high i
South
made
failed
were d
blocka
year,
To him
allows
on Sa
qualifi

The
and bu
we hea
from e
(i. 299)
shadow
Church
Arthur
Aberde
fidence.
wrote v
it was
question
object
Arthur
1843 (i.
Ireland,
that dat
and pec
state of
establis
marshal
Policy,

the House of Commons and in the courts. Few readers fail to enjoy the story, told by one of the actors, of the way in which the greater business of the nation is conducted ; and the account of the unfortunate delays which led, quite innocently, so far as the Government was concerned, to the escape of the 'Alabama' from Liverpool, has many ingredients of romance. We confess too, ourselves, to a desire to have assisted unseen at the interview when 'Lord Westbury sent for Sir Robert Collier and myself, and gave us a lecture on the duty of the law officers to confine ourselves to questions of law, without meddling with policy' (ii. 381). Feeling ran high in this country between the supporters of North and South ; and the dispassionate statements of law and right made by Sir Roundell Palmer in Parliament sometimes failed to please either side. The most important of these were delivered in the debate of March 1862, on the right of blockade under the Treaty of Paris ; and, in the following year, in defence of the action taken as to the 'Alabama.' To himself it was a time of immense labour ; and he actually allows that he once worked from 2 A.M. on Monday to late on Saturday without going to bed ; 'but,' we read with a qualified sense of relief, 'this was exceptional' (ii. 457).

The friendships of middle life, when habits are formed and business imperative, cannot be as those of youth. Yet we hear of some warm attachments ; among them one, dating from early professional days, with James Robert Hope Scott, (i. 299), though over this was thrown from the first the shadow of an impending difference on the question of Churches ; and one formed in the House of Commons, with Arthur, afterwards Sir Arthur, Gordon, youngest son of Lord Aberdeen. This ripened into lifelong affection and confidence. It was to Arthur Gordon that Sir Roundell Palmer wrote with most entire unreserve on political subjects, and it was to him that, in 1856, he opened his mind on the question of the Irish Church Establishment, then lately the object of a vehement attack by Mr. Bright, with which Arthur Gordon had expressed sympathy. As long ago as 1843 (i. 347) Roundell Palmer had travelled through parts of Ireland, visiting Mr. Godley and other friends ; his letters of that date, full of zest and of enjoyment of the wild country and people, also show constant observation of the religious state of the country, and of the probable effects of Disestablishment. In his letter to Sir Arthur Gordon he marshals his arguments under the three heads of Justice, Policy, Religion (ii. 290).

The justice of Disestablishment, or the injustice of allowing a body to retain what it has enjoyed for 300 years, must rest upon some assumed political axiom. This may be that 'Church property is national property.' But this implies the fallacy that there was once an unappropriated public fund which the State portioned out; it ignores the truth that the property is rather national because ecclesiastical, than ecclesiastical because national. Or it may be contended that the establishment of the Church of a minority in Ireland is inconsistent with the establishment in England and Scotland of the Church of the majority. The answer to this is that Ireland only attained to equality of civil rights long after the 'Protestant' Church was in fact established, and that the equality was conceded on the express condition that the Establishment should continue.

With regard to policy, he claims that the Establishment in Ireland is a power making for good, and not for evil, while the civilizing influence of the modern type of Roman Catholicism is yet untried; that the numerical preponderance of Roman Catholics in Ireland is on the decrease; and that the Roman Catholics there do not, on the whole, regard with irritation the present state of things. On the other hand, in view of existing opinion in England and Scotland, he dismisses as unpractical schemes for concurrent endowment, or for the exclusive establishment of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland.

Lastly, upon grounds of religion, the confiscation and secularization of Church property shocks the moral sense; while establishment, doubtful benefit though it be to the form of religion established, yet, from the provision which it secures for the spiritual welfare of the poor, and from the continuity which it maintains with the spirit of better days, may not lightly be thrown over; further, an ancient establishment can never be replaced by new creations of the State.

'Far better, in my opinion, would it be for the interests of religion to have no Church establishment at all, than to create new establishments of that sort in the present day—better for the State to leave the entire work of religious organization to voluntary agency unassisted, than to offer a material without a moral support, to patronize religion not religiously, and to back all parties alike in the arena when Truth and Falsehood are contending, as if there were no Falsehood and no Truth. By such support, I think (agreeing in this, I suspect, with Bright) that all the religious bodies would be degraded and enervated, the progress of their religion retarded rather than advanced, and the State not hallowed or elevated' (ii. 300).

W
left to
in 18
estab
memo
it tou
great
and to
prizes
nothin
prizes
he wo
servic
dissip
princi
gives
likely
used o
and s
of a so
wise n
phrase
we se
these
and in
humbl
recogn
studen
insepa
accom
not sti
title-p
writte
a coun
and do
steadil
founde
towers
light sh

We have, for reasons which will be readily understood, left to the end this statement of Lord Selborne's views held in 1856 on the question of the Irish Church and of Church establishments. We now part, in mid-career, with the memorials of a great and good life. It was a great life, for it touched greatness at many points. It was lived among great interests, and in the face of questions vital to the nation and to the human race. It was the life of one to whom great prizes came, who accepted them naturally, 'as one to whom nothing is great' (ii. 369); of whom it was early clear that prizes must follow him, if they were to come at all, for that he would not 'stoop nor lie in wait for them.' It was great in services done for his age and for posterity, if to have dissipated mischievous confusions, and to have upreared principles in the desert of details and second-hand truths, gives a title to rank among benefactors. Its goodness few are likely to question, though this is a word not lightly to be used of any man. Perhaps the conception of this rare lawyer and statesman which rises most readily in the mind is one of a somewhat austere type of goodness; of the 'good and wise man,' the 'good and prudent man' of ancient Roman phrases. As we look more closely the lineaments relax, and we see variety and mobility in the portrait. We read in these Memorials of ardent friendships, of a delight in Nature and in all beautiful things, of a hearty sympathy with men of humbler, not necessarily of the humblest, station. We recognize, to use words addressed by Lord Selborne to the students of St. Andrews in 1878, 'a well-spring of youth, inseparable from the sense of personal identity, which accompanies from childhood to the grave every man who has not stifled in himself the higher emotions.' Certainly, as the title-page reminds us, they that say such things as are written in these Memorials, 'declare plainly that they seek a country.' They are loyal to the country of their sojourn, and do hearty service for it; but there rises before them, seen steadily above the damp and shifting mists of earth, a city founded upon the unshaken adamant, having domes and towers which point right upwards, and walls radiant with the light shed upon them by natural piety and Christian hope.

ART. III.—ST. CATHARINE OF SIENA.

1. *The Dialogue of the Seraphic Virgin, Catherine of Siena, dictated by her while in a state of Ecstasy to her Secretaries and completed in the Year of our Lord 1370.* Translated from the original Italian, with an Introduction on the Study of Mysticism by ALGAR THOROLD. (London, 1896.)
2. *The History of St. Catherine of Siena and her Companions.* By AUGUSTA THEODOSIA DRANE, Author of *Christian School and Scholars*, &c. Compiled from original Sources. (London, 1880.)
3. *Catharine of Siena. A Biography.* By JOSEPHINE E. BUTLER, Author of the *Memoir of John Grey of Dilton*, &c. Second Edition. (London, 1879.)

A PASSING reference of half a dozen lines in the *History of Latin Christianity* to Catharine of Siena leads its accomplished author to insert in a note some extracts from one of her letters, which he thought might serve to 'illustrate the times, the woman, the religion.'

'It was addressed,' he continues, 'to her confessor, Raymond of Capua, when she was hardly more than 32, and she urges him in the most rapturous phrases to hide himself in the wounded side of the Son of God. "It is a dwelling full of delicious odours, even sin takes a sweet perfume. Oh blood! Oh fire! Oh ineffable love."'

The purpose of the letter is to relate the story of the execution of Nicola Tuldo, a young knight of Perugia—Dean Milman did not trouble himself to ascertain either the name of the sufferer or the circumstances of the tragedy—under conditions calculated to draw forth Catharine's boundless sympathy and devotion.

'The day before his death,' the Dean proceeds to say, 'she conducted him to the Mass: he received the Eucharist, from which he had before kept aloof. The rest of the day was passed in ineffable spiritual transports. "Remain with me," he said, "and I shall die content." His head reposed on her bosom. She awaited him next morning on the scaffold. He came at length, suffering his fate with the gentleness of a lamb, uttering the name of the Saviour. She received his head in her hands. At that moment appeared to her the God Man with the brightness of the sun. She was assured of her friend's salvation. She would not wash off the stain of the rich-smelling blood from her garments. Yet, though she must remain on earth, the first stone of her tomb was laid. Sweet Jesus! Jesus Love!'¹

¹ *Latin Christianity*, vol. iii. p. 26, note 6.

To the
pathe
comm
'S
betwe
So ha
—the
day o
to us
autho
mean
sweet
for p
hymn
in th
judgm
which
incorr
Is all
no fac
onwar
classif
and R
flood
wherei
the pu
all the
and sp
descen
examp
that ev
cause,
that in
bale
wealth
honour
urged
the des
Popes,
and, if
deeply
Let
and cha

To this—when all its circumstances are known—intensely pathetic narrative the historian adds two lines of scornful comment as follows :

‘St. Catharine had the stigmata. And this woman interposed between Popes, Princes, and Republics !’

So hasty and contemptuous a dismissal of a startling fact—the extraordinary influence of a poor ecstatic woman in a day of unblushing profligacy and unbridled violence—seems to us quite unworthy of so highly-gifted a writer. Could the author of the *Fall of Jerusalem* accord no poetic and tender meaning to that mention of the Wounded Side, which a sweet Psalmist of our own day has adopted from the Latin for public and private use in one of our choicest modern hymns? ¹ Was it nothing but a coarse realism—and if coarse, in the estimation of our more refined and supersensitive judgment, yet pardonable because of its intense reality—which cherished even the material blood for the sake of the incorruptible and precious Life of which it is the symbol? Is all mysticism folly and every vision pure delusion, and are no factors worthy of account in the chronicle of mankind’s onward march adown the centuries save such as can be classified under the dignified categories of Popes, Princes, and Republics? Was the promise of a Sacred Presence in flood and fire ² limited to Jewish days or to the first ages wherein Christian martyrs perished, so that in all after years the pungent horrors of reek and stench were to be added in all their unmitigated intensity to the other sufferings, bodily and spiritual, which tender women had to endure? Or, to descend from these general principles to a single concrete example, if the modern scientific teaching be unquestionable that every effect invariably betokens and implies an adequate cause, is it not worth stopping to inquire how it came about that in the middle of the fourteenth century—of all improbable eras—the daughter of a Sienese dyer, without beauty, wealth, or learning, had unsought and unwelcome diplomatic honours thrust upon her, was heard with respect as she urged most distasteful counsels, and in crises which affected the destiny of Christendom ‘interposed’ effectually ‘between Popes, Princes, and Republics’? We propose to examine and, if possible, to solve some of these (as we deem them) deeply interesting questions.

Let us first, however, say a few words about the scope and character of the three works before us.

¹ Rev. Sir H. Baker’s ‘Jesu grant me this, I pray.’

Mr. Thorold prefaces his translation of the *Dialogue* by a pretentious Introduction which traces the decline of naturalism and the revival of belief in dogmatic Christianity in France. With much stilted verbiage and after ostentatious parade of learning and lofty criticism of a wide sweep of modern French literature, he elaborates the conclusion that 'the problem of modern thought remains what it has always been, namely, to "synthetise the here or real of antiquity with the hereafter or ideal of mediævalism," and that both these elements must appear in any attempted solution.'¹ Perhaps the reader who is unfamiliar with the use of language so abstruse will hardly be helped on learning a little further on that mysticism 'may be defined as the reduction to the emotional modality of the highest concept of the intellect'; but let him not be discouraged: the *Dialogue* itself is entirely free from such bombastic turgidity. It would have been more to the purpose if the interior life so amply described in the *Dialogue* had been illustrated by some account of Catharine's public career; but for knowledge of this we must turn to the two biographies before us. Mrs. Butler's work is stigmatized by Mrs. Drane as a *Protestant* history; and Mr. Thorold asserts that Mrs. Drane's is *the only English Life written with any comprehension of the subject*. The distinction between them is clearly fundamental, and when we consult the two writers it comes out in strong relief.

In attempting some account of Catharine's outer life it is hard to select firm standing ground, so closely blended is the mixture of fact and fable. Mrs. Butler's wise discernment renders her biography 'necessarily unsatisfactory' to her Anglo-Roman rival, who has yet, as she informs us, strictly excluded from her narrative of nearly 700 pages 'all imaginary details,' and has introduced nothing for which there do not exist 'unimpeachable authorities.'² Yet no sooner do we commence Mrs. Drane's biography than we are filled with invincible misgiving. It literally rains miracles—some utterly purposeless, futile, and inept; others radiant with the beauty of some heavenly truth outshining through transparent legend; others, again, apparently an inwrought mental image on which intensity of feeling has all unconsciously and in good faith bestowed material reality. They crowd on us on all occasions and in every form. Catharine floats in mid air down the staircase without touching it; is carried as one flying home; is clothed in a robe drawn from

¹ *The Dialogue*, p. 9.

² Drane, Preface, p. xix.

the S
on he
falls i
out th
wine
her to
upon
surpa
appea
vario
thorn
the co
celebr
suster
from
dove

Fi
recor
strang
beauty
daugh
and L
a dyes
of chie
towns
From
housel
a man
she w
longed
with c
return
mothe
which
enam
in abst
tion th
to be
blossom
old her
With
time an
the urg
but th
bewaile

the Saviour's side, and espoused with a ring placed by Him on her finger, and visible to no mortal eye save her own ; she falls into the fire and is not burned ; learns how to read without the aid of human teaching and its drudgery ; multiplies wine in a barrel and dries it up at will ; there is healing in her touch, and favours unexampled and ineffable are showered upon her such as no saint in all the Calendar can equal or surpass. She has visions of the Holy Trinity, and the Saviour appears to her as He did to St. Martin and under other various disguises. She is permitted to wear the crown of thorns and to quaff the stream of life from the Pierced Side ; the consecrated Host flutters towards her in the hands of the celebrant, and a fragment of it flies from the altar for her sustenance ; the Lord Himself shines on her with approval from the monstrance, and the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove hovers over her at prayer.

From such prodigies it sounds prosaic to turn to the bare record of unquestioned history ; but here, if fact be not stranger than fiction, it is rich with lessons of no ordinary beauty and impressiveness. Catharine of Siena, the twin daughter and youngest of the twenty-five children of Giacomo and Lapa Benincasa, was born March 25, 1347. Her father was a dyer in comfortable circumstances, who had filled the office of chief magistrate, and was held in repute among his fellow-townsmen. Her mother was a decent, featureless woman. From very early years Catharine, the baby and pet of the household—her twin sister having died in infancy—displayed a marked tendency to the religious life. At six years old she was ecstatic and had celestial visions ; at seven she longed for the life of a hermit, and having set forth one day with childish impetuosity to attempt it, she resolved on her return upon a life of celibacy. Often she reproved her mother for unseemly words with the humility and gentleness which characterised her after years. Already she had become enamoured of asceticism, and indulged as much as possible in abstinence and fasting. Already to her childish imagination the sinfulness of little sins assumed a portentous guilt, to be washed out only by the sternest penances. Life blossomed early then in Italy, and ere she was twelve years old her parents cast about for a suitable marriage for her. With this thought Lapa urged her daughter to give more time and care to personal adornment, and for a while, under the urgent persuasion of her elder sister, Catharine yielded ; but the relapse was brief, and ever after was bitterly bewailed as a serious backsliding. Sustained by the advice

of her confessor, she secretly cut off her long golden hair, to the unbounded indignation of her mother, and persisted she would live and die a virgin.

On this avowal the full force of parental displeasure fell upon the child. There should be no more secret brooding, and hard work should dissipate all idle dreams. She was deprived of her own little chamber, and made to do all the household drudgery. But Catharine's mind was cast in no common mould. Despite severe labour and cutting reproaches, happy visions played around her and transformed the kitchen to a sanctuary. In her imagination those on whom she waited were transfigured, and her mother became the Blessed Virgin, her father Christ Himself, her brothers and sisters the disciples and apostles: what she did for them was done for Him, and the beautiful conceit robbed her servitude of all its pain. As she had no chamber of her own to pray in, she used any which happened to be vacant, and in such devotion her father once surprised her, and his opposition gave way. It could hardly have needed the strange presence of a white dove to prove that a spirit so gentle yet so firm, so humble yet so tenacious of a self-denying purpose, was really overshadowed by power from on high. While yet a child she was admitted to the ranks of the Mantellate, the Third Order of St. Dominic. Her vocation was unquestionable. An ardent disciple of St. Dominic and St. Francis of Assisi, her life henceforth was an unbroken series of austerities. Self-discipline became a passion, and was pursued with merciless severity. So meagre was her diet that report asserted that she lived exclusively on the consecrated Host; so scanty her indulgence in sleep that she eventually, after a terrible struggle with nature's cravings, reduced her slumbers to one half hour only in the twenty-four. Even so, her poor frail body of humiliation was subjected to the further torture of unsparing flagellation, of the hair shirt and the iron chain. The heart sickens as it reads of such frightful horrors, needlessly borne with lofty determination absolutely to subdue the flesh to the spirit. What wonder if throughout her after-life she suffered terrible agony, 'which resembled the dislocation of the bones of the breast, and which never left her'?

We cannot linger over the narrative of Catharine's early trials and temptations. A life of solitude and almost unbroken silence for the first three years after she had received the Mantle of Penance brought its wonted experience of deep mental conflict, and the rumour of her exceptional piety would hardly fail to elicit envy and beget malicious calumny.

In such
trod the
that wh
witness
dreamla
practica
It woul
for a t
which C
those fi
dispose
visions.
vated, a
might o
into dea
ticity o
when in
the dea
the gift
Christ
mind a
some t
friendly
no mira
graphy
clearne
to see t
inner li
ecstasy
tion so
Cathari

It is
that hu
antedec
served
some
elemen
conditi
in her
social
than S
unsucc
failure.
tyrant
cherish

In such things and in her victory over them Catharine only trod the ordinary path of the saints. Her idiosyncrasy, and that which makes her stand out among the great cloud of witnesses, is the singular union in her of an ecstatic life of dreamland with remarkable powers of spiritual analysis, of practical benevolence, and of high-toned political sagacity. It would be deeply interesting, if we had sufficient authority for a trustworthy conclusion, to determine the degree in which Catharine's self-discipline rendered her more liable to those fits of ecstasy to which she was constitutionally predisposed, and their effect, if any, in giving intensity to her visions. A habit of ecstasy may, we are assured, be cultivated, and a frame weakened by torture and lack of sleep might easily be mesmerised at the first glance of the Host into deathlike trance; but we should like to test the authenticity of the record which describes Catharine's sensations when in the state of coma. Some of these visions dramatize the deep but fundamental verities of the New Testament—the gift of a new heart, the death unto sin, the espousal to Christ; some picture the apocalyptic scenes with which a mind absorbed in spiritual thoughts is fain to indulge itself; some testify to the strength which family affection and friendly ties had over the heart of the seer. All these need no miracle for their explanation such as in Mrs. Drane's biography is ever in attendance; but in their strength and clearness they are certainly so abnormal that we are startled to see them commingled with the acute discrimination of the inner life displayed in the *Dialogue*, dictated by her during ecstasy, and corroborated by concern for the world's salvation so overpowering as to become the lifelong study of Catharine's waking and active existence.

It is an accepted maxim of our latest political philosophy that human character and efficiency are the mere product of antecedent and attendant circumstances, and, without unreservedly admitting so broad an assertion, we may yet find some light cast upon the most salient and exceptional elements in Catharine's career by learning the temper and conditions of the age in which her lot was cast. Life in Italy in her days was darkened by the deepest shadows of civil and social strife, and no city had been more terribly distracted than Siena by political dissensions in which the blood of the unsuccessful party was the ruthless and invariable penalty of failure. Monsters of iniquity, like Barnabo Visconti, the tyrant of Milan, held high place and power and were the cherished allies of cardinals and princes. Vice stood out

unblushing. Feuds, in which kindred blood was shed remorselessly, sundered members of the same family. Sensuality was glaring and was not yet draped in the decorum of a later age. Doubtless there were, even in that day, peaceful homes where order and decency prevailed, but a single touch serves to illustrate the difficulty of sheltering the women of such houses from the poison of the prevailing atmosphere. One of Catharine's brothers-in-law asked his wife why she was so often in tears, and she replied it was because of the indecent language of his friends at their table to which she had not been accustomed before her marriage. Such an incident speaks volumes. How could the Christian life be lived under such conditions? Catharine had pondered the question deeply, and had reached a clear and definite reply. The flesh—the channel of all evil—must be mercilessly kept under. The world, steeped in sensuality and bloodshed, could only be saved through the precious blood freely given by redeeming Love, and it was her vocation and her privilege to be a fellow-worker in its salvation and a partaker of Christ's sufferings. With simple and absolute self-renunciation she devoted herself to the conversion of all with whom she was brought in contact, however hopeless the task might seem. She realised (as we shall see) to the full the enormities which prevailed, and her sense of them only brought into higher relief the infinite cost at which infinite Love made atonement for them. But it was her signal characteristic that her faith in the efficacy of that atonement was ever unclouded, and when others would have utterly despaired she held unfalteringly the conviction that 'the Saviour's blood *can* endear the dregs of a polluted life.'¹ It is startling to read how simply she invites the most abandoned to repentance, and with what confidence she speaks of Christ's readiness to save to the very uttermost. Hence her repeated cry of rapture—'Oh Blood! Oh Fire! Oh Ineffable Love!'

Such brief illustration as the limits of our space allow of Catharine's home life, of her writings and of her embassies to foreign courts, may serve in some degree to set her striking personality in rapid outline before our readers.

The picture of her more private life is singularly attractive. Permitted to assume the robe of the Order of Penitence at sixteen, and subjected at that early age to self-imposed austerities under which her health was hopelessly broken, when Catharine believed herself, two years later, to be summoned to a more active life, it was seen that neither solitude nor

¹ *The Christian Year.* Sunday next before Advent.

suffer
gaiety
forms
fiercer
Mant
despit
tongu
and c
and m
a pea
obeye
quotes
addre
besee
each
egotis
exper
voice
sweet
Gradu
intima
Cenni
men o
felt he
visions
and gu
the inf
or reb
sweetn
her op
We
the wo
in mos
'She
used to
compan
St. Don
togethe
and alw
never ex
the mor
the stern
to visit
the sigh
Her elo

suffering nor sickness had impaired the sweetness or even the gaiety of her nature. Where disease in its most loathsome forms was raging, or where political passion broke out in fiercest conflict, there the emaciated figure of the young Mantellata, as yet barely twenty years old, might be seen, despite the frowns of prudent matrons and the scandal of evil tongues. Upheld by the consciousness of a divine vocation and of entire submission to a higher will, her purity of life and motive was gradually recognized and her intervention as a peacemaker widely sought. Full of loving kindness, she obeyed all such calls without hesitation, and Mrs. Butler quotes the assertion of a contemporary that he had seen her address a multitude of two thousand persons in the streets, beseeching them for the love of Jesus to be at peace with each other, to examine themselves to discover any secret egotism and to give up what could only be gratified at the expense of one's neighbour. Those who could not hear her voice were moved even to tears by the beaming charity and sweetness of her countenance while she spoke and pleaded. Gradually she gathered around her a spiritual family of intimate associates—Raymond of Capua, Father Matthew of Cenni, Stephen Maconi, and others. Priests, hermits, painters, men of learning, courtly ladies and laughing girls, all in turn felt her irresistible attractiveness. Some became her secretaries and wrote her letters; others penned at her dictation the visions which compose her *Dialogue*; others accompanied and guarded her on her numerous journeys; all succumbed to the influence of a penetration which never failed to discern or rebuke their inmost shortcomings, and to the fascinating sweetness which melted the most prejudiced and obdurate of her opponents.

We must make room here for a condensed quotation of the words in which Friar Bartholomew, who accompanied her in most of her missions, describes her:

'She was very fond of lilies, roses, violets, and all flowers, and used to make them up into superb wreaths and bouquets. Her companions were young maidens like herself, wearing the mantle of St. Dominic. I often saw them sitting weaving flowers and singing together. When I began visiting her in her house she was young and always wore a smiling countenance. I also was young, but I never experienced any trouble in her presence. On the contrary, the more I conversed with her, the more I became in love with all the stern virtues. I knew many young monks and laymen who used to visit her, and they all experienced impressions similar to mine; the sight of her and all her conversations breathed angelic purity. Her eloquence was wonderful, and great multitudes of men and

women flocked to hear her preach. . . . Frequently she dictated to two or three secretaries at once, and that without any hesitation or contradiction. She told me . . . God said to her, "I have appointed thee, my daughter, to a new manner of life. Thou shalt go from city to city as I will indicate to thee; thou shalt live with the multitude and speak in public. I will send some to thee and thee to others, according to my good pleasure. Be thou ever ready to do my will." I never saw the least shade of melancholy in her countenance, which was always cheerful and ever merry. When the pain in her side tortured her cruelly, and hindered her from rising, her friends pitied her and said, "Mother, how you are suffering!" She would smile and say, "I feel a gentle trouble in my side," and she would add, "I think I know how my Lord suffered when one of his hands was already nailed and they drew the other arm with such violence that his ribs were disjoined." Whenever she spoke of the martyrs her face would flush and her eyes would gleam, and she would spread out her white robe and smilingly say, "Oh, how lovely it would be if it were all stained with blood for the love of Jesus!"¹

The reality of these professions had been tried to the utmost while the plague was raging at Siena with its attendant horrors. The city had been well-nigh depopulated by it in the year of Catharine's birth, and the pest returned with unparalleled violence when she was in her twenty-sixth year. Many fell stricken in the streets and the churches, 'as spoiled fruit falls from the trees,' and died in a few hours. It is needless to dwell on the well-known and frightful details—the terror, the panic, the entire loosening of moral fibre, the ministrants on a sudden lifeless beside the corpses they were burying, the streets in which none were left to answer the call of 'Bring forth your dead,' the putrescent odours, the despair. Amidst such scenes Catharine and the members of her mystic family moved with the sublime tranquillity which only absolute faith could inspire. Among the poorest of the stricken population, through the most infected districts, they ministered unceasingly and sang hymns of praise as they wrapped the poor discoloured corpses in their winding-sheets. Many of the devoted Mantellate fell, chilled by the hand of death, in the midst of their labours, and ten of Catharine's nearest relatives were carried off by the pestilence, but the survivors, 'knowing well' (says the chronicler²) 'that they had entered into the presence of Jesus, pressed the last kiss on their foreheads and hastened back with increased zeal to their labour of love.' It was not of necessity miraculous power, in the technical sense of the word, which Catharine exerted

¹ Butler, *Life*, pp. 111, 112.

² Chavin de Malan, quoted by Mrs. Butler, p. 95.

in ca
Fath
Who
that
the s
sence
assur
their
an eff
blood
exerc
cacy
Fr
the co
and co
tation
The s
tise or
taries
revelat
title w
educat
indulg
Dialog
intrica
tempta
sagacie
and tha
growth
origina
much p
of its
Divine
further
has sec
literatu
baldnes
It woul
explana
soul's g
Church
obedien
century
masterly
God, an
VOL.

in calling back from the very gates of death her dear friend Father Matthew and others whose case seemed hopeless. Who can measure the value, in that reign of terrors, of courage that never quailed and cheerfulness that never blenched, of the soothing magnetic touch of those holy hands, of the presence that ever seemed to be not of this present world, of the assuring words whose confidence was contagious and secured their own fulfilment? And if in such influences there be not an efficacious antidote to plague-poison actually working in the blood, we are the last to call in question the unremitting exercise of an overruling Providence, and the abiding efficacy of believing prayer.

From these scenes of active benevolence we must turn to the contemplative side of Catharine's highly complex nature, and consider the important treatise on which her great reputation as a mystic, yet a highly practical, teacher is based. The so-called *Dialogue* is an elaborate and long-drawn treatise on the spiritual life, dictated by Catharine to her secretaries while in ecstasy, and professing to relate the divine revelations which had been vouchsafed her. Under such a title we might expect that an ignorant girl of most imperfect education—she had not even been taught to write—would indulge in futile and disconnected rhapsodies; but the *Dialogue* presents a singularly acute analysis of the subtle intricacies of human character, a lucid exposition of the temptations to which the spiritual life is specially liable, with sagacious advice upon the best methods of surmounting them, and that firm grasp of fundamental verities, from which all growth in grace derives its sustenance and support. As originally composed, it was one unbroken dissertation of much prolixity and wearisome tautology; but in the hands of its editors it has been divided into four treatises—on Divine Providence, Discretion, Prayer, and Obedience—and further subdivided into 148 chapters. We read that its style has secured the approval of competent masters of Italian literature, despite its curious mixture of metaphors and a rustic baldness which is conspicuous even in its English rendering. It would be easy to denounce as mystical and fantastic its explanation of the five kinds of tears and of the stages of the soul's growth, and its doctrine is, of course, that of the Roman Church of its day, before the changeful course of the Latin obedience had adopted the Mariolatry of the nineteenth century. But, apart from controverted questions, it is so masterly an exposition of the science of the soul's union with God, and at the same time presents so vivid a picture of

prevailing evils beneath which all spiritual life might well have been crushed out, it blends so wondrously the rapture of the mystic with the shrewdest dictates of Christian common-sense, it is so lofty in aspiration, so unflinching in diagnosis, so thorough in treatment, and so simple in its conclusions, that its lessons are of efficacy for all time. We have been at some pains to summarize the teaching of the *Dialogue* on a few crucial points, that the reader may form his own judgment of the young girl who could so trace out 'the hygiene of the soul.' The topics we have selected have specially to do with the Love of our Neighbour, the nature of Prayer, and the character and duty of the Priesthood. The first may show how inseparably that altruism which our modern Positivists claim as their peculiar boast was an essential element in the Christianity of the darkest, as of all other, ages of the Church. The last will illustrate how deep was the darkness which Catharine's piety illumined, and with what intrepidity she strove to dissipate it.

However reasonably the charge of excessive other-worldliness may be brought against mediæval Christianity in general, it cannot truthfully be alleged against Catharine of Siena. So mystic a spirit, it might have been anticipated, would be too completely uplifted in rapture above all secular concerns and too entirely absorbed in its own spiritual ecstasy to have leisure for the welfare of others; but such an estimate would be an egregiously mistaken one. Throughout the *Dialogue* the essential and fundamental duty of putting the love of our neighbour before self-love is enforced with a persistent reiteration and earnestness which would satisfy the most exacting of contemporary Positivists; and the doctrine of altruism, the pseudo-discovery of recent times, reaches its highest expression and its widest development in this treatise handed down from the dark ages. 'It is in the neighbour,' she says in her quaint fashion, 'that is to say, in the love of him, that all virtues are founded' (p. 31). All scandals, hatred, cruelty, and every sort of trouble have proceeded from the perverse root of self-love, which has poisoned the entire world, weakened the mystical body of Holy Church and the universal body of believers. Diversity of gifts and inequality of fortune are providentially ordained for this very purpose, 'in order that man should, perforce, have material for love of his fellow; that one should have need of the other, and that they should be God's ministers to administer His graces and gifts' (p. 34). The misconduct and wickedness of a neighbour do not excuse the failure of love

to him
patien
time o
love.
Catha
Altrui
as a m
living.
becaus
(p. 42)
soul si
manly
devoti
were p
endurin
the life
profit a
because
same t
neighb
ever cr
eternal
glory.
neighb
behind,
begotte
seest th
life, the
such lo
union v
other:
neighb
(p. 153)
It is
tempera
solation
object o
surroun
withdra
mental
vain. I
in Italy
revoluti
if its ch
ment of

to him, but only test its strength and reality. The virtues of patience, benignity and kindness manifest themselves in a time of wrath; and envy, vexation and hatred demonstrate love. Nor in her constant insistence on this topic does Catharine place any limit to the measure of its exercise. Altruism is by turns depicted as a motive for self-discipline, as a means to spiritual growth, and as the highest end of holy living. If charity ought to be concerned first with self, it is because otherwise it will never be of perfect utility to others (p. 42). It is the supreme office of holy discretion that the soul should direct all her powers to God's service with a manly zeal, and that she should love her neighbour with such devotion that she would lay down a thousand times, if it were possible, the life of her body for the salvation of souls, enduring pains and torments so that her neighbour may have the life of grace, and giving her temporal substance for the profit and relief of his body (p. 42). It cannot be otherwise, because love of God and of her neighbour are one and the same thing, and so far as the soul loves God, she loves her neighbour (p. 32). Nay, more; altruism, with its desires for ever crying to God for the salvation of the whole world, is eternal, and will form part of the felicity of the saints in glory. For, because their life ended in the love of their neighbour, they have not left it (*i.e.* love of the neighbour) behind, but with it they will pass through the Door, 'My only begotten Son, in the way that I will relate to thee. So thou seest that in those bonds of love in which they finished their life, they go on and remain eternally' (p. 91). Only through such love of our neighbour can the fourth state of perfect union with God be attained; the one cannot be without the other: for there can be no love of God without love of the neighbour, nor love of the neighbour without love of God (p. 153).

It is the inherent and inevitable tendency of the mystic temperament to be so enamoured of its own spiritual consolation as to neglect all else in the pursuit of this one supreme object of desire. The more repulsive the condition of the surrounding world, the greater also the temptation entirely to withdraw from its pollutions and to find in uninterrupted mental abstraction the beatific peace sought elsewhere in vain. Hard, coarse, and brutal as was much of secular life in Italy at this period, amidst the cruelties of incessant revolutions and the horrors of internecine war, what wonder if its choicer spirits sought within cloister walls the enjoyment of a delicious, but enervating, religious Nirvana? With

her keen spiritual insight and boundless self-sacrifice, Catharine was ever on the alert against this insidious peril, and combated it with weapons of no ordinary precision. The rapture of the inner vision, the ineffable grace of mental prayer, the sweet consciousness of divine communion, the performance even of religious duties at their stated hours, must, she insisted, all yield to the supreme duty of ministering to our neighbour's necessity, spiritual or temporal. On this point the voice of Heavenly Truth spoke through her with emphatic clearness and redundant demonstration as follows:

'Those who desire to taste and receive Me mentally in their own way offend Me more by not relieving their neighbour's necessity than if they had abandoned all those things whereby they receive consolation; for all vocal and mental exercise is ordained by Me to bring the soul to perfect love of Me, and of the neighbour, and to preserve her in this love. Therefore, in failing in love to his neighbour a man offends Me more than if he had abandoned his ordinary exercise and lost his peace of mind; and, moreover, he would truly find Me in exercising love towards his neighbour, whereas in seeking delight in his own consolation he is deprived of Me, for by not succouring his neighbour immediately, his love for him diminishes, and his love for his neighbour diminishing, My affection towards him also diminishes, and thus is his consolation diminished too. So that, thinking to gain, he loses, and where he would think to lose he gains. That is, being willing to lose his own consolation for his neighbour's salvation, he receives and gains Me and the neighbour too, succouring him and serving him charitably, and tasting each time he does so the sweetness of My love. But, not doing so, he suffers pain, for sometimes it happens that he will be obliged, either through love or force of circumstances, to help his neighbour either for some spiritual or corporal infirmity, and doing it in this way he does it with mental tedium, being pricked by conscience, and becomes insupportable to himself and to others. And should anyone ask him "*Why dost thou feel this pain?*" he would reply, "*I seem to have lost all peace and quiet of mind, and many things that I used to do I have left off, and I think that thereby I have offended God.*" But he is mistaken. He has placed the vision of the eye of his intellect on his own delight alone, and therefore he discerns not, nor knows where his offence truly lies. Because, could he discern, he would see that his offence does not consist in not having his customary mental consolation, or in having abandoned the exercise of prayer in the time of his neighbour's need, but in having been found without true love for his neighbour, whom he should love and serve through love of Me' (pp. 146-7).

We hold that the extracts already given—and they might be very largely extended—will be admitted by every impartial judge to prove conclusively that Catharine was no

mere
her
upon
joy.
enlig
storm
Sea
Deity
of he
the la
ful—
neces
one's

'I
the fi
develo
soul o
therefo
every
herself
immed
that I
which
that sh
pure lo
fore en
her—n
can all
virtues
in gene
receive
love th
That p
loved
tion of
you—b
create
repay t
neighb
your ov
solely f
loved b

Th
and sp
piety,
transc
tions, s

mere visionary enthusiast. In her divine philosophy, as in her daily life, the highest practical benevolence was insisted upon as the indispensable and co-equal test of true spiritual joy. The affection and the intellect, both spiritually enlightened, must advance hand-in-hand. Through the stormy ocean of deep humiliation the soul may pass to the Sea Pacific, which is God Himself, the Supreme and Eternal Deity, to fill the pitcher of her heart. And her eye, the conduit of her heart, may shed tears in the effort to satisfy its pangs—the last stage in which the soul is both blessed and sorrowful—but even here the task of altruism is not over. It is still necessary to bear with others and practise continually love to one's neighbour.

'In this way' (continues the Divine instructor) 'will the soul feel the fire of My love in herself, because love of her neighbour is developed out of love for Me—that is, out of that learning which the soul obtained by knowing herself and My goodness in her. When, therefore, she sees herself to be ineffably loved by Me, she loves every rational creature with the selfsame love with which she sees herself to be loved. And, for this reason, the soul that knows Me immediately expands to the love of her neighbour, because she sees that I love that neighbour ineffably, and so herself loves the object which she sees Me to have loved still more. She further knows that she can be of no use to Me, and can in no way repay Me that pure love with which she feels herself to be loved by Me, and therefore endeavours to repay it through the medium which I have given her—namely, her neighbour, who is the medium through which you can all serve Me. For, as I have said to thee, you can perform all virtues by means of your neighbour. I have given you all creatures, in general and in particular, according to the diverse graces each has received of Me, to be ministered unto by you; you should therefore love them with the same pure love with which I have loved you. That pure love cannot be returned directly to Me, because I have loved you without being Myself loved, and without any consideration of Myself whatever, for I loved you without being loved by you—before you existed! it was indeed love that moved Me to create you to My own image and similitude. This love you cannot repay to Me, but you can pay it to My rational creature, loving your neighbour without being loved by him, and without consideration of your own advantage, whether spiritual or temporal, but loving him solely for the praise and glory of My Name, because he has been loved by Me (pp. 183-4).

These quotations conclusively determine the character and spirit of Catharine's religion. Hers was no mere visionary piety, no delusive quietism entranced in the enjoyment of transcendental dreams. If she believed in visions and revelations, she was keenly alert to the dangers of misusing them,

and she laid down trustworthy tests by which to 'try the spirits whether they be of God.' With the sagacity of a past master in the dissection of spiritual experience, she prescribes rules for distinguishing between divine and uninspired ecstasy. The joy and consolation, she affirms, 'which exist without a burning desire for virtue, and are not anointed with humility and on fire with Divine love, are not of heavenly origin.' 'Of course,' she adds, 'not everyone is deluded by this joy, but only those imperfect ones who seek only for delight and consolation, and look rather to the gift than the giver' (p. 226). She showed no less penetration when treating of bodily penance, and her utterances on this subject are the more remarkable when we remember the extraordinary austerity which she habitually practised.

'No one' (she writes) 'should judge that he has greater perfection because he performs great penances, and gives himself in excess to the slaying of his body, than he who does less, inasmuch as neither virtue nor merit consists therein; for otherwise he would be in an evil case who, for some legitimate reason, was unable to do actual penance. Merit consists in the virtue of love alone, flavoured with the light of true discretion, without which the soul is worth nothing' (p. 41).

We pass to her teaching on the subject of Prayer.

Perfect prayer is not attained through many words, but through affection of desire; and the soul will exercise together mental and vocal prayer, for, even as the active and contemplative life is one, so are they (p. 141). A holy desire is a continual prayer, as is also charity and anything contributed by words or deeds towards another's salvation, although it does not replace a prayer which one should make oneself at the appointed season, 'as My glorious standard-bearer Paul said, in the words "He who ceases not to work ceases not to pray"' (p. 142). If we do not recognize the quotation, they recall to us Martin Luther's dictum, *Laborare est orare*, and remind us of the inner agreement which unites all faithful souls. The treatise of Prayer is not restricted to the subject which furnishes its title. It also unfolds the various stages of grace, from the first imperfect efforts of repentance prompted only by fear of future punishment through the growth of self-knowledge and consequent self-hatred, which gradually leads to such humility and entire self-surrender that pain and pleasure are equally welcome as coming from the love of the Crucified. Those who have thus arrived at *the great perfection* can in no way be separated from the love of God in Christ.

prayer
is to
affect
the v
and n
My S
the lo
Hear
purity
rising
they
havin
taste
I am
Food,
Word
God a
ness,
slacke
benefit
may a
journe
of My
sweet
amoro
their l

CR
'arising
of Ch
fire o
them
'the s
became
heavin
soul o
absorb

'T
gazes u
intellec
These
and inf
sees no
speak,
it for th
name.
membe
trary to

'Every place is to them an oratory, every moment a time for prayer—their conversation has ascended from earth to heaven—that is to say, they have cut off from themselves every form of earthly affection and sensual self-love, and have risen above themselves into the very height of heaven, having climbed the staircase of the virtues and mounted the three steps which I figured to thee, in the Body of My Son. On the first step the feet of their affection are divested of the love of vice ; on the second they taste the secret love of the Heart, where they can see desire of virtue ; on the third, the step of purity and peace of mind, they find in themselves the virtues, and, rising above imperfect love, they attain the great perfection. For they have found rest to their souls in the doctrine of My Truth, having found both Table and Food and Server, which Food they taste through the doctrine of Christ crucified, My only-begotten Son. I am their Bed and Board, and My sweet and amorous Word is their Food, for they eat the Bread of souls in the person of this glorious Word, for I give Him to you, that is His Flesh and Blood, wholly God and wholly man, in the Sacrament of the Altar, by My Goodness, while you are still pilgrims and wayfarers, so that you may not slacken your pace through faintness, or lose the memory of the benefits of the Blood shed for you with so much fire of love, and may always be able to comfort and delight yourselves while on your journey. The Holy Spirit serves these souls, for He is the affection of My charity which ministers to them both gifts and graces. This sweet Servant both fetches and carries, to Me their painful but sweetly amorous desires, and to them the fruit of the Divine Love and of their labours' (pp. 163-4).

Chapter lxxix. describes the ecstasy of souls which 'arising with anxious desire run by the Bridge of the doctrine of Christ crucified, and arrive at the gate, and burning with the fire of love they taste in Me, the Eternal Deity, Who am to them a Sea Pacific' (p. 166). In the ardour of its transport 'the soul is raised from the earth *almost as if the heavy body became light*. But this (she adds) does not mean that the heaviness of the body is taken away' (*ib.*). Yet although the soul does not actually leave the body, its every faculty is absorbed in the seraphic vision :

'The memory is full of nothing but Me ; the intellect, elevated, gazes upon the object of My Truth ; the affection, which follows the intellect, loves and becomes united with that which the intellect sees. These powers being united and gathered together, and immersed and inflamed in Me, the body loses its feeling, so that the seeing eye sees not, and the hearing ear hears not, and the tongue does not speak, except as the abundance of the heart will sometimes permit it for the alleviation of the heart, and the praise and glory of My name. The hand does not touch and the feet walk not, because the members are bound with the sentiment of love, and as it were, contrary to all their natural functions, cry to Me, the Eternal Father, for

the separation of the soul from the body, as did My glorious Paul, saying, "Oh wretched man that I am, who will separate me from this body?" (pp. 166-7).

Such a soul, being yet in the mortal body, scarcely knows whether she be in the body or out of it, and, because her will is dead in Christ, tastes bliss with the immortals.

The reader will recognize beneath the quaint mystic phraseology how much of deep spiritual truth is enforced, and will share our admiration of the clearness of insight attained at a comparatively early age, and amidst most unfavourable surroundings.

We must compress within a very brief space any further notice of the *Dialogue*. We would gladly have said something upon Catharine's handling of other important topics; as, for example, her insistence upon the essential and permanent necessity for the deepest humility. On some searching texts her comments are remarkable for unqualified fidelity to the letter of the command, with the happiest and most suggestive turn in its application, e.g. 'Judge not,' on which she urges, 'Abandon judgment, which is Mine, and take up rather compassion, with hunger for My honour and salvation of souls.'¹ Many a gem, clear and sparkling, might be culled from her pages. Never was the duty of man's absolute surrender of his will to the will of God more resolutely enforced, yet never was treatise brighter with invincible hopefulness. Of all the sins, that which is pardoned neither here nor hereafter is Despair;² for God's mercy is greater without any comparison than all the sins which any creature can commit.³ It is the blessed Gospel message, identical through all the centuries of the Church.

Yet how far the Church then was from setting forth this Gospel appears in the *Dialogue* with unexpected force, since the reverence in which Catharine held the priestly office does but serve to bring into stronger relief the frightful disorder then prevalent in the ranks of the clergy.

'I have appointed them,' so says her Divine Instructor, 'to be in very truth your guardian angels to protect you; to inspire your hearts with good thoughts by their holy prayers, and to teach you My doctrine reflected in the mirror of their life, and to serve you by administering to you the holy Sacrament, thus serving you, watching over you, and inspiring you with good and holy thoughts as does an angel' (p. 261).

Such was her conception of what priests should be, and it

¹ *Dialogue*, p. 221.

² *Id.* p. 305.

³ *Id.* p. 305.

stands in shocking contrast with her elaborate indictment of the sins so widely prevalent which she alleged against them, and which can only be fully comprehended by somewhat profuse quotation.

'In whatever direction thou mayest look amongst secular and religious priests, clerics, and prelates, small and great, young and old, and of every kind, thou wilt see nothing but offences against Me, and the stench of mortal sin which they all exhale; which stench, indeed, hurts Me not at all, but themselves grievously. . . . They have placed their principle and foundation in their own self-love, whence have grown the tree of pride and the offshoot of indiscretion; for indiscreetly do they seize honour and glory for themselves, seeking great prelacies and ornaments, and delicate treatment for their bodies. . . . Inflated with pride they cannot satiate themselves with gnawing the earth of riches and worldly delights, becoming mean, greedy, and avaricious towards the poor, from which miserable pride and avarice, born of their own self-love, they have abandoned the care of souls' (pp. 263-4).

After enlarging upon the avarice and simony of the priesthood as well as their sumptuous luxury, she proceeds:

'Woe, woe to their wretched life! For they waste with harlots that which My only-begotten Son, the sweet Word, acquired with such pain upon the wood of the holy Cross. They are devourers of souls bought with the Blood of Christ, devouring them in their great misery, in many and diverse ways, and with the substance of the poor do they feed their children. O temples of the devil, I have appointed you to be earthly angels in this life; and you are devils, for you have taken the work of devils. These devils give in return darkness, for what they have received from their flocks, and administering to them cruel torments, drag their souls away from grace with persecutions and temptations, in order to reduce them to the guilt of mortal sin, striving to do what they can to this end; although no sin can occur unless the tempted soul herself wish it, yet they do what they can. So these wretches are not worthy of being called My ministers: they are incarnate devils, for by their sin they have conformed themselves to the will of the Devil, and do his work' (pp. 264-5).

'They have chosen for their table the public tavern, and there openly cursing and perjuring themselves, full of many sins, like men blinded and without the light of reason, have become animals through their sins, and live lasciviously in word and deed. They do not know if there be any Divine Office, and if sometimes they say it, they do so with their tongue only, their heart being far away from Me. They are also cheats and rogues, and having played for their soul and lost it to the Devil, they stake the goods of the Church and the temporal substance which they receive by virtue of the Blood, cheating and gambling it away' (p. 268).

We must, however, abstain from further quotation on

this terrible subject, regarding which, as Catharine proceeds, her indignation waxes stronger, and her denunciation more vehement. 'O demons and more than demons!' she cries, 'if only your iniquities were more concealed, you would indeed hurt yourselves, but not do the harm you now do to your neighbour.' Again and again she returns to the charges, and the catalogues of crimes alleged against the clergy and the religious houses is a frightful one—profanity at the altar, impurity in the confessional, sensuality in the cloister, nameless abominations. No heavier indictment was ever laid by the bitterest of Protestant writers than that which can be gathered from the *Dialogue*.

For the more public life of Catharine and her interference between Popes, princes, and republics, we must refer our readers to the biographies before us. Mrs. Butler gives a graphic account of Catharine's embassy to Avignon to endeavour to make peace between Florence and the Pope, when she exerted all her powers to persuade Gregory XI. to restore the Papacy to its rightful seat at Rome. That wasted form wherein the sanctified spirit was so precariously veiled, clad in its coarse yet spotless robe of white and its scrupulously patched black mantle, was a strange mediator between the luxurious Papal Court and the fierce Eight of War which dominated the splendid Tuscan capital. Yet no envoy ever bore himself more undaunted than the humble-minded *popolana* of Siena. Unmoved alike by the extraordinary magnificence of the palace and the alternate scorn and cajolery of the beautiful women who too largely swayed the Curia, she concentrated every thought on inducing the irresolute Pontiff to return to Italy. 'Are you not imprudent,' she was asked by her devoted disciple, Father Raymund, 'to reject so brusquely the attentions of these ladies?' 'If you had been as conscious as I was of the stench of sin that was perceptible whilst one of them was speaking, it would have made you sick,' was the stern reply. On one occasion Catharine lingered over a magnificent volume in the study of which she was apparently engrossed, and Gregory stood alone and silent by her side. At last he said, 'It is here I find repose for my soul in study and in the contemplation of nature.' She raised her head and in a tone of inspiration said to him, 'In the name of God and for the fulfilment of duty you will close the gates of this glorious palace, you will turn your back on this lovely country, and set out for Rome to dwell amidst ruins, tumults, and malaria.' The story cannot be written out in detail here, but the Babylonish captivity was brought to its

close
follow
wild
7
diffic
Flor
capit
enda
pare
on th
ques
para
wom
Sien
Chun
nego
effort
asked
sore
prese
able.
out d
noble
'garb
cours
pover
Urba
nals.
of a
ance,
confic
all go
Ponti
from
must
a chan
prayer
necess
her la
was f
seeme
of her
last le
with s
and pi

close by Catharine's irresistible persuasiveness, and early in the following year Gregory entered the Eternal City amidst the wildest exclamations of popular delight.

The joy of Catharine's triumph was tempered by the difficulties which impeded the restoration of peace with Florence, by the political troubles which distracted the capital of Tuscany, and during which her own life was seriously endangered, by the urgent need for Church reform and its apparent hopelessness, and by the great schism which broke out on the election of Urban VI. as successor to Gregory XI. We question whether the annals of Christendom can supply a parallel to the influence exercised by this simple self-denying woman. In the internecine conflicts which in turn distracted Siena, Pisa, Florence; in the trouble of the entire Western Church through the emigration of the Popes to Avignon; in negotiations with the fiercest partisan leaders, and in efforts to win over the most powerful European princes, men asked for Catharine's assistance and advice; and in Urban's sore extremity on the election of an antipope, it was her presence and support in Rome that he felt would be invaluable. In obedience to his summons Catharine set forth without delay, more than forty persons accompanying her. Great nobles claimed the honour of following, on foot and in the 'garb of poverty,' in her train. Her 'spiritual family,' of course, shared her journey, and all agreed to live in holy poverty in the Eternal City. Soon after her arrival, on Urban's invitation she addressed the assembled cardinals. 'The Lord is on our side—be strong and of a good courage,' was the burden of her utterance, and her intrepidity was contagious. With unwavering confidence in the righteousness of her cause, she summoned all good and holy men to come to Rome and uphold the true Pontiff. Nor would she take denial from those who shrank from leaving the undisturbed devotion of the cloister. 'You must be very slightly established in devotion,' she writes, 'if a change of residence would cause you to lose the habit of prayer. Is God only to be found, even in times of public necessity, in woods and solitudes?' For months her letters, her labours, her prayers were unremitting; but her strength was fast wearing out, and she was so emaciated that she seemed like one who had issued from the tomb. Conscious of her approaching end, she dictated last counsels to Urban, last letters to her friends, last prayers, and then, worn out with sufferings which filled all beholders with love and awe and pity, but which failed to check her ever ready smile of

greeting, this woman, who literally ruled Rome by the force of her prayers and the omnipotence of her love, in her thirty-third year, on April 29, 1380, entered into the rest of the Paradise of God.

It would be hard to find a narrative more sweet and tender than the 'Transito' of Catharine, or, as its title phrases it, the 'order of the glorious and happy end of this most sweet virgin, according as our base intellects are able to comprehend the same, overcome as they are with immense grief.' We would fain transcribe the whole chapter, but must content ourselves with the final paragraph.

'The end drawing nigh, with great fervour she prayed for all her beloved children whom God had given her, and whom she loved with a passing great love; using many of those words which our Lord spake when He prayed to His Eternal Father, imploring earnestly, and with most sweet words, that every hard heart might become softened. Then at last she said, "Father, they are Thine and Thou gavest them to me, and now I give them back to Thee. Eternal Father, do Thou keep and guard them, and I pray that none of them may be snatched out of Thy hands." And so praying for us—she spoke with such tenderness we thought our hearts would cleave asunder—she signed and blessed us. Then once more making the sign of the cross, she blessed all those who were not there corporeally present. Then feeling the approach of her long and much-desired end, still persevering in prayer, she said "Lord, Thou callest me to come to Thee, and I come; not in my own merits, but only in Thy mercy, which mercy I ask in virtue of the most precious blood of Thy dear Son." At last she exclaimed several times "Blood! Blood." Then gently pronouncing the words "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit," bowing her head, she gave up the ghost. Her death took place about the hour of sext, on Sunday, the feast of St. Peter Martyr, of her order. And we kept her precious body until Tuesday evening, during which time it remained fresh, of devout and angelic beauty, and emitting a sweet fragrance.'¹

Which final prodigy seems to us allegorical of her memory through all succeeding ages.

¹ Drane, *Life*, p. 568.

ART. IV.—THE PAPAL BULL ON ANGLICAN ORDERS.

1. *Letter Apostolic of His Holiness Leo XIII. concerning Anglican Orders.* (London, MDCCCXCVJ.)
2. *The Bull 'Apostolicæ Curæ' and the Edwardine Ordinal.* By F. W. FULLER, M.A. (London, 1896.)
3. *A Treatise on the Bull 'Apostolicæ Curæ.'* (London, 1896.)
4. *On the Bull 'Apostolicæ Curæ.'* By H. B. SWETE, D.D. (Cambridge, 1896.)
5. *De Hierarchia Anglicana Supplementum.* Auctore T. A. LACEY. (Romæ, 1896.)

A YEAR ago we dealt in this Review¹ with what was then the latest phase of the old controversy upon Anglican Orders. It has now been succeeded by another and, so far as our adversaries are concerned, the final development. On September 15, 1896, Leo XIII. published an unqualified condemnation: 'Of Our own motion and certain knowledge We pronounce and declare that Ordinations carried out according to the Anglican Rite have been and are absolutely null and utterly void.'² There is no need to recapitulate the circumstances which led up to this decision. The only question is, What is it worth?

The Pope himself puts us in a position to estimate its worth when he details to us the 'Prescribed Method of Examination'³: 'We commissioned a certain number of men noted for their learning and ability, whose opinions in this matter were known to be divergent.' It is an open secret that Cardinal Vaughan's nominees, Canon Moyes, Father Gasquet, and Father David, met in debate with M. Duchesne, Mgr. Gasparri, and the Jesuit P. de Augustinis; and that these last three, 'the most distinguished historian, canonist, and theologian of the commission, were in some sort united in defence of English Orders.'⁴ Instructions were given to the commissioners which are worthy of attention. Each was required to state the grounds of his opinions in writing. All were then to exchange these written statements, and to investigate the subject further in the light of any documents bearing upon it that might be found either in the Vatican archives or even at the Holy Office. Thus equipped, they met in

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, January and April, 1896, Nos. 82 and 83.

² *Letter*, p. 22.

³ *Ibid.* § 2.

⁴ *Contemporary Review*, December 1896, p. 794.

twelve sessions held under the presidency of Cardinal Mazzella, and 'all were invited to free discussion.' The 'acta' of these sessions and the documents produced were then submitted to the cardinals of the Supreme Council of the Inquisition. They were sent in, it is said,¹ on June 8. On July 16 the Suprema met under the presidency of the Pope. The cardinals gave their 'sententiæ' one by one in his presence. It was a Thursday, 'Feria V.' After an interval of two months the Pope pronounced sentence in the Bull of September 15, in accordance with the unanimous decision of the cardinals.²

'These proceedings,' as Dr. Swete observes,³ 'wear the appearance of thoroughness and impartiality ;' but in reality they were neither thorough nor impartial. They were not thorough, for, as we shall show presently, the question was not really reopened. They were not impartial, for the inquiry laboured under unfair restrictions. Thus the commission was made up entirely of members of the Roman Church, though perhaps, as the commissioners were men of divergent views, not charged to adjudicate upon the issue, but only to collect and sift the evidence, the fact that it was only a board of Papal nominees is of little moment. It is of more importance to observe that its discussions, though nominally free, were held under the eye of a cardinal, and that freedom of discussion does not by any means necessarily carry with it freedom of initiation and freedom of resolution. What we should like to know, and are not informed, is, not whether the experts were free to discuss what was put before them, but whether they were free to bring up any aspect of the question which might be thought deserving of attention. By the side of freedom of initiation and resolution, freedom of discussion is an inconsiderable advantage ; and the latter is the only freedom which the commission was promised. Further, once the commissioners had gone through the documents and arguments, the case passed entirely out of their hands. They were not asked to vote, or to act as judges. The unanimous vote by which Anglican Orders were condemned was given by the cardinals, not by the experts ; by the cardinals, too, as 'Judges of the Supreme Council.'⁴ After these cardinals had voted the Pope took two months to consider, not the terms of the decision, but whether it was 'expedient'⁵ to issue any judgment at all. It is not hard to read between the lines of these proceedings. Mixed tribunals are not favourite organs with despotic governments. They belong to the category of

¹ *Contemporary Review*, December 1896, p. 795. ² Letter, § 10, p. 22.

³ *On the Bull*, p. 8.

⁴ Letter, § 10, p. 21.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 22.

fre
was
miss
duty
of a
ence
signi
body
who
Whi
at th
enco
conse
cardi
ance
with
met
that
ment
recog
dulty
Orien
its ex
nor s
ance
when
merit
and
indee
not h
prece
astica
the d
which
and
entitl
author
Engla
of Fa
the ca
was t
whate

free institutions, and can only work in a free atmosphere. It was a wise precaution, therefore, that, while the mixed commission should be entrusted with the task of discussion, the duty of coming to a decision should be laid upon the shoulders of a more responsible and, as it would be said, more experienced body. Wise indeed from the Papal point of view, but significant from ours. For the decision was now left to a body of men who were not experts in the matter at issue, and who would not decide simply on the merits of the case. While by their own traditions they were predisposed to arrive at their conclusion with a rigid regard to precedent, they were encouraged by voices from England to have an eye also to consequences. Is it reasonably to be supposed that the cardinals of the Supreme Council have any particular acquaintance with the service books of the Church of England, and with its history at the Reformation? Mr. Lacey tells how he met a 'distinguished person' in Rome, who, on being told that 'the English Ordinal certainly contained the same elements at least as were contained in the Eastern Ordinations recognized at Rome,' received the remark with 'polite incredulity.'¹ Clearly this eminent individual knew little of the Oriental and less of the English rite. But every Church has its experience of dignified officials who are neither scholars nor specialists. We have no wish to complain of the ignorance of such personages; but we have just cause of complaint when a question which is eminently one to be decided on its merits by the accurately informed is taken out of their hands and adjudicated upon by a body of councillors who had indeed the specialists' memoranda before them, but could not help being influenced in their decision by practice and precedent and by the necessities, real or supposed, of ecclesiastical politics. That such considerations were imported into the decision we have abundant proof in two rival documents which were drawn up and circulated to influence the cardinals, and have since been published. The first of these was entitled *De Re Anglicana*,² and was 'a brief account,' says its author, Mr. Lacey, 'of the present state of the Church of England.' He wrote it with the concurrence and assistance of Father Puller, very unwillingly, but by desire. 'One of the cardinals to whom the question of the English Ordinations was to be submitted frankly allowed that he knew nothing whatever about the English Church, and would welcome

¹ *Guardian*, November 11, 1896, p. 1818.

² Cf. for the text *Guardian*, October 7, 1896; *Tablet*, November 7, 1896.

information.¹ It was confessedly an *ex parte* statement, but 'composed with careful moderation and candid truthfulness';² nor can we blame its authors for complying with a request that came from so high a quarter, and might have borne nobler fruit. But it was soon met by a rejoinder from the pen of Dom Gasquet and Canon Moyes, which gave their view of the religious situation in England and of the prospects of reunion.³ We have no space to reproduce or to criticize their statement, and no need; for the point we are now contending for is that the circulation of documents such as these—though they differ remarkably in tone and tenor—was both mischievous and irrelevant. The *Tablet* affects to make out that they were innocuous. 'Both these documents,' it says, 'were issued when the sessions of the Pontifical commission had come to a close. They were not, therefore, occupied with, nor could they affect, the decision upon the intrinsic merits of the question of Anglican Orders.'⁴ Of course not; but where, as in this case, the decision was not given 'upon the intrinsic merits of the question,' nor by those who had been deputed to deal with it on its merits, they were well calculated to affect it. Considerations about the religious situation in England, and the prospects of reunion, *i.e.* of probable converts to Rome, were just the sort of considerations to influence the court which gave the final vote, with the Pope at its head, on July 16, 1896. The mere fact that such documents were asked for and sent round affords the best possible evidence that the case was decided, not by scholars on its merits, but by men of affairs on grounds of policy. The decision was not free. It was not impartial. It was encumbered by adventitious calculations of advantage. The Pope's expected crop of converts, and the sustentation fund for 'converted Anglican clergymen,' which he recommended in a letter of August 23, 1896,⁵ to Cardinal Vaughan, suggest irresistibly the same conclusion. They indicate clearly enough the nature and sources of the influence brought to bear upon the simplicity of the Pope and upon the cardinals. So much, then, for the impartiality professed in the Bull.

We now turn to examine the thoroughness of the Papal investigation. Was the inquiry really reopened? Again the Pope provides the answer. 'It was necessary, with a view to forming a true estimate of the real state of the question, to

¹ *Guardian*, October 7, 1896, p. 1514.

² *Ibid.*

³ For text see *ibid.* September 30, 1896, p. 1488, and *Tablet*, November 14 and 21, 1896.

⁴ *Tablet*, November 7, p. 743.

⁵ *Guardian*, September 30, 1896, p. 1471.

ente
stoc
Apo
Juli
thro
the
inter
conf
sider
refer
the
pass
and
by a
which
prin
law."
1684
only
and s
that
settle
is rea
obvio
know
the ca
Catho
questi
No
The e
tion, h
closed
venien
practic
proced
sidered
questio
history
nals th
rule in
observ

enter upon it after a careful inquiry as to how the matter stood in relation to the prescription and settled custom of the Apostolic See.¹ Accordingly the Bulls and Breves of Julius III. and Paul IV. were first produced and gone through. They were treated as unquestionably the source of the later Roman 'practice, which has been observed without interruption for more than three centuries, that Ordinations conferred according to the Edwardine rite should be considered null and void.'² They were also interpreted by reference to this practice; for, as if to meet by anticipation the well-founded charge that 'the language of these long passages, specially about Orders, is very cumbrous, confused, and disjointed,'³ we are candidly invited to consider that 'if by any chance doubt should remain as to the true sense in which these Pontifical documents are to be understood, the principle holds good that "custom is the best interpreter of law."⁴ Two cases which came up for decision at Rome in 1684 and 1704 were adduced, out of many, to show that 'not only did the Apostolic See tolerate this practice, but approved and sanctioned it.'⁵ 'Hence it must be clear to everyone that the controversy lately revived had been already definitely settled by the Apostolic See.' So the appropriate conclusion is reached; not, however, without an ungracious rebuff, meant obviously for the French clergy: 'It is to the insufficient knowledge of these documents' (*i.e.* certain which concern the case of 1704) 'that we must attribute the fact that any Catholic writer should have considered it still an open question.'⁶

Now on looking at this procedure one can only smile. The examination did not lead to the reopening of the question, but only to the discovery that it had long ago been closed. 'Doubtless,' too, as Dr. Swete observes, 'it was convenient, if not "necessary," to begin with the history of Roman practice, and no objection could have been urged against this procedure if the question of validity had been afterwards considered entirely on its own merits. But, in point of fact, the question was, as the Bull shows, prejudged in the light of history.'⁷ Evidence was produced which satisfied the cardinals that 'absolute reordination'⁸ has been the invariable rule in dealing with 'converted Anglican clergymen.' The observance of this rule is then treated as proof of the matter

¹ Letter, § 3, pp. 6, 7.

² Dixon, iv. 329 n.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *On the Bull*, p. 9.

VOL. XLIII.—NO. LXXXVI.

⁵ *Ibid.* § 4, p. 12.

⁶ Letter, § 4, p. 12.

⁷ *Ibid.* § 6, p. 15.

⁸ Letter, § 4, p. 12.

in hand. First, an appeal is made to one's sense of Papal propriety. Reordination is sacrilege. Of course, then, 'it never could have come to pass that the Apostolic See should have silently acquiesced in and tolerated such a custom,'¹ as it must have done had Anglican Orders been valid. Ever treated as invalid, they cannot have been valid, whereas the whole question is whether the treatment was right. When what is wanted is evidence to show that the Roman practice did not in fact amount to sacrilegious reordination, the Bull rides off into an excellent example of the *argumentum ad fideles* that no Pope could ever have done such a thing! But, as it happens, this is a contention specially worthless in this case; for, if there are any Papal decisions which have been found embarrassing, it is those concerned with ordination. At the end of the ninth century, after the death of Pope Formosus, the Italian Church was thrown into confusion by a general rejection and repetition of Orders—'ordinatio, exordnatio, et superordinatio.' In the eleventh century, when simony was accounted heresy, Leo IX. reordained a number of persons on this ground. Gregory VII. made the invalidity of all simoniacal ordinations a fixed rule.² In the face of the principle that heresy or unworthiness in the minister of the sacraments is no bar to their effect, these are certainly instances of sacrilegious reordinations on the part of Popes. But to return. It is next assumed in the Bull—unwarrantably, as we shall see—that the Roman practice of reordination had its origin in the letters of Julius III. and Paul IV.; and the interpretation of these documents, in spite of the very pertinent arguments and researches of English scholars,³ is handled in one direction only, as if they were incapable of any other. Finally, in the last historical case appealed to—that of Gordon in 1704—we are told that Clement XI., in giving that decision which ever since 'was quoted as the norma,'⁴ rested it exclusively on doctrinal grounds, viz. 'the defect of form and intention'; other reasons for invalidity being set aside, 'as documents of incontestable authenticity prove.'⁵ Here one can only ask in amazement, Why, then, be at such pains to examine the previous decisions of Julius III. and Paul IV., which, obscure as they are, avoid any but a decision as to practice? Why trouble to trace to them the present Roman practice of reordination, when, in view of Clement's 'norma' its origin can be only a matter of antiquarian interest?

¹ Letter, § 4, p. 12.² Janus, *The Pope and the Council*, p. 52.³ Cf. *Supplementum*, pp. 6-13.⁴ Letter, § 5, p. 15.⁵ *Ibid.* p. 13.

Why
autho
right
that,
regan
alone

T
Paul
is lav
the d
sent
atten
and f
these
revisi

T
cerned
de Fa
'Disp
(3) the
Janua
bearin
mini U
dated
these
(July
and J
August
and w
him no
with R
in repl
by reci
Extrac
and, in
between
others
give c
having
the alt

¹ Cf.² Cf.³ Cf.ney's *Do*
Bulla F

Why, again, if there exist 'documents of incontestable authenticity,' were they not produced and put in their rightful place in the forefront of the Bull, when it is clear that, so far as the invalidity of Anglican Orders is to be regarded as 'definitely settled,' it rests on them and on them alone?

The inclusion, then, of the decisions of Julius III. and Paul IV. seems to us gratuitous. But both space and stress is lavished upon them by Leo XIII., and so before reviewing the decree of Clement XI., on which it is clear that the present pronouncement hangs, they seem to demand closer attention. And we are glad to give it; for further study and fuller evidence has convinced us that the treatment of these documents which we adopted a year ago requires revision.¹

There are five principal documents in question, all concerned with the mission of Pole.² They are (1) the 'Breve de Facultatibus' of Julius III., dated March 8, 1554; (2) the 'Dispensatio Generalis' issued by Pole, December 24, 1554; (3) the 'Facultates pro Episcopis,' issued by Pole, and dated (?) January 29, 1555; (4) the Bull 'Præclara carissimi' of Paul IV., bearing date June 20, 1555; and finally (5) the Breve 'Regimini Universalis' of Paul IV., issued to explain his Bull, and dated October 30, 1555. Now for the historical setting of these instruments. No sooner was the accession of Mary (July 6, 1553) announced in Rome, than a consistory was held, and Julius III. appointed Pole legate by a Bull dated August 5, 1553.³ For a year or more he was detained abroad, and while thus on his way discovered that his faculties gave him no power to deal with Orders bestowed since the breach with Rome. He asked for further authority, and received in reply the Breve of March 8, 1554. This document begins by reciting word for word the greater part of the 'Bull of Extraordinary Faculties' granted to Pole on August 5, 1553, and, in the recitation, reproduces a general distinction made between persons *rite et legitime promoti vel ordinati* and others *non promoti*. Provision is first made for the Legate to give dispensations to those who are in holy orders, that having purged their irregularity they may again minister at the altar and hold their benefices as before.

¹ Cf. *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 82, January 1896, pp. 290 *sqq.*

² Cf. for texts *Treatise*, App. A, pp. 43 *sqq.*

³ Cf. Dixon, iv. 96, and a note on 'Pole's Chronology,' p. 110; Tierney's *Dodd*, II., App. p. cvij, gives Pole's *Bulla Institutoria* and his *Bulla Facultatum Extraordinariorum*, &c.

'Quodque bigamia et irregularitate, ac aliis præmissis non obstantibus, in eorum ordinibus, dummodo ante eorum lapsum in hæresin hujusmodi rite et legitime promoti vel ordinati fuissent, etiam in altaris ministerio ministrare, ac quæcunque et qualitercunque etiam curata beneficia . . . ut prius . . . retinere.'

But there was a number of persons who had obtained possession of benefices though they had never been ordained or were only in minor orders. Such persons, if otherwise fit and proper persons, may be ordained and hold benefices ;

'et non promoti ad omnes etiam sacros et presbyteratus ordines ab eorum ordinariis, si digni et idonei reperti fuissent, promoveri ac beneficia ecclesiastica . . . recipere et retinere valeant.'

There is no reference here to the Edwardine clergy. Lower down the Breve provides that Pole may use his powers of dispensation

'erga alias personas . . . ad te pro tempore recurrentes vel mittentes, etiam circa ordines quos nunquam aut male susceperunt, et munus consecrationis quod eis ab aliis episcopis vel archiepiscopis etiam hæreticis et schismaticis, aut alias minus rite et non servata forma ecclesiæ consueta impensum fuit.'

This language, too, is equally general. It respects not rites, but persons ; for Julius III. had received a brief description of 'the pertinent parts of the new Ordinal' ¹ before he issued these instructions, and in them says nothing about it.² This description belongs clearly to the early days of Mary's reign, for it is followed on the same sheet by the first words of the proclamation of Lady Jane Grey. Julius, therefore, had it before his eyes when he supplied Pole with his fresh batch of dispensing powers. What he did, then, in this Breve was to allow the exercise of orders to any bishop who had been consecrated *non servata forma ecclesiæ consueta*. The verification of this conclusion is to be found in the next two documents, Pole's *Dispensatio Generalis* and his *Facultates pro Episcopis*, and in the use to which he put his faculties. They were, as their terms show, for dispensation ; and, as the whole purpose of Pole's mission required, not condemnatory but conciliatory in aim. The Legate at once proceeded, in virtue of them, to grant dispensations (March 17, 1554) to five bishops elect, who were accordingly consecrated *libere et licite* by Gardiner, Bonner, and Tunstall on April 1,³ as also to others to be translated—*e.g.* Wharton to Hereford, March 17, 1554, and Thirlby to

¹ Letter Ap. § 3, p. 9.

² Cf. *Supplementum*, App. II., p. 42, for text.

³ Cf. Denny and Lacey, *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, § 229, and refs.

Ely, Au
who, so
nunquam
prelates
1554, th
issued
served
1 & 2 P
invalid ;

'Ac
aliquas in
tam ord
materias,
nulliter
restitutæ
recipiunt

This, h
but Pau
satio six
very diff

'Pers
ordines
concern
nulliter
bus et be
'Concer
be little
from th
Pole's, a
quoting
represent
Pole's do
may be
the valid
nected w
abolition
in quotin
tia,' is g
upon the
third of
way in w

¹ Cf. D.

and compa

² Cf. G.

History, p.

³ Letter

Ely, August 19, 1554.¹ These, then, were among the persons who, so far as their episcopal orders went, had received them *nunquam aut male*. They were not Edwardine but Marian prelates. Then, after his arrival in England, November 20, 1554, the Legate absolved the realm on November 30, and issued his *Dispensatio Generalis* on December 24. As preserved to us in the *Statute Book*—for it is recited entire in 1 & 2 P. & M. c. 8²—it appears to treat previous orders as invalid:

'Ac omnes ecclesiasticas . . . personas,' says the Legate, 'quæ aliquas impetrationes, dispensationes, concessiones, gratias et indulta, tam ordines quam beneficia ecclesiastica, seu alias spirituales materias, prætensa auctoritate Supremæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, licet nulliter et de facto obtinuerint, et ad cor reversæ Ecclesiæ unitati restitutæ fuerint, in suis ordinibus et beneficiis . . . misericorditer recipiemus.'

This, however, is neither good grammar nor good sense: but Paul IV., who quoted the greater part of Pole's *Dispensatio* six months later in his Bull *Præclara*, makes it run very differently.

'Personis quæ diversas impetrationes &c. . . . et indulta tam ordines quam beneficia ecclesiastica seu alias spirituales materias concernentia prætensa auctoritate Supremæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ nulliter et de facto obtinuerant et ad cor &c. . . . ut in suis ordinibus et beneficiis remanere possent, dispensavit.'

'Concernentia' is an important addition; and there can be little doubt that it is the right reading; for apart from the fact that Paul IV.'s version makes sense, and Pole's, as ordinarily given, nonsense, the Bull of Paul IV., quoting directly from the *Dispensatio*, is far more likely to represent the original accurately than the printed copies of Pole's document. But if so the passage in the *Dispensatio* may be dismissed as irrelevant. It has nothing to do with the validity of orders, but only refers to dispensations connected with orders &c. which had been obtained since the abolition of the Roman jurisdiction; and the Bull of Leo XIII., in quoting 'the same Pontifical Letter'³ without 'concernentia,' is guilty of a serious oversight. We are thus thrown upon the *Facultates pro Episcopis* of January 29, 1555, the third of the above documents, for the understanding of the way in which Pole took the instructions of Julius III. Here,

¹ Cf. Denny and Lacey, *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, § 229, and refs., and compare Lea's *Spiritual Jurisdiction*, pp. 34, 37.

² Cf. Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, p. 397.

³ Letter Ap. § 3, p. 10.

in subdelegating his faculties to the Ordinaries, the Legate bade the Ordinaries allow [those who were 'promoti']

'irregularitate et aliis præmissis non obstantibus in suis ordinibus, etiam ab hæreticis et schismaticis episcopis etiam minus rite, dummodo in eorum collatione ecclesiæ forma et intentio sit servata, per eos susceptis, et in eorum susceptione etiamsi iuramentum contra papatum Romanum præstiterint, etiam in altaris ministerio ministrare. . . . et non promoti ad omnes etiam sacros et presbiteratus ordines a suis ordinariis, si digni et idonei reperti fuerint, rite et legitime promoveri.'

Again, the language of the Legate is very vague. He does not take Julius III. to say, as Leo XIII. makes him say, that in the Edwardine Orders 'the form and intention of the Church were not observed.'¹ He holds himself at liberty to bid the Ordinaries accept all orders, though irregularly conferred, in which the form and intention of the Church were observed. He knew, as well as his master, that the Edwardine rite was not the usual 'Ritual Form,' or 'forma consueta.' But he does not allude to that phrase of Julius III., and professes himself ready to accept any orders 'dummodo in eorum collatione ecclesiæ forma et intentio sit servata.' His language, in fact, was quite general, and was purposely so. He lays down a principle clear enough in its general purport. The bishops are to act for themselves, and would apply it according to the *communis sententia* which then prevailed as to what the essential form was. They needed no further guidance. 'There is here no formal acceptance of the Edwardine Ordinal; but still less is there any formal condemnation, expressed or implied.'² When all was thus in train for the general restitution, Thirlby, Bishop of Ely, with two others, was sent, on February 16, 1555,³ to inform the Pope of the reconciliation, and to obtain his sanction for what had so far been done.

Shortly before the embassy arrived in Rome⁴ Paul IV. was elected Pope on May 23, 1555. He received the ambassadors in June, and, in answer to their petition for a pronouncement confirmatory of Pole's work, issued the Bull *Præclara carissimi*, June 20, 1555. It ratified the Cardinal's proceedings, but with this proviso:

'Ita tamen ut si qui ad ordines ecclesiasticos tam sacros quam non sacros ab alio quam episcopo aut archiepiscopo rite et recte ordinato promoti fuerunt eosdem ordines ab eorum ordinario de novo suscipere teneantur, nec interim in iisdem ordinibus ministrent.'

² *Treatise*, p. 15.

¹ Letter Ap. § 3, p. 10.

³ Dixon, iv. 378 n.

⁴ *Ibid.* iv. 381.

P
some
but m
his p
before
that h
those
reach
by th
stake
Strict
Rome
Mary
vacan
twent
before
after
four
crated
rite.'
the o
been
agitate
be do
condes
docum
Octob
to red
possib
'No
eorum
menten
clarius
tantum
et conse
Th
bishop
of thos
too. V
of the
not set
sion p
depend
ness o

Paul IV. thought, apparently, that there may have been some in England who had been ordained by an unfit minister, but makes no allusion to an invalid rite. Yet he also, like his predecessor, had the description of the Edwardine rite before him when he gave these instructions. The truth is that his additional proviso seemed to affect many more beside those who had Edwardine Orders. So when the Bull *Præclara* reached England the question was at once raised—probably by the bishops themselves, for their own position was at stake—Who, then, are the bishops ‘rite et recte ordinati’? Strictly, none who had been promoted since the breach with Rome in 1533 could be, on Roman principles, so described. At Mary’s accession out of twenty-seven existing sees two were vacant and twenty-five had incumbents. But out of these twenty-five, while only three, or possibly four, were consecrated before the breach with Rome, twenty-one were consecrated after it, sixteen by the Pontifical, one by a mixed rite, and four by the Edwardine Ordinals.¹ Some had been consecrated by ‘heretics,’ many by ‘schismatics,’ ‘et alias minus rite.’ They had not received Papal confirmation, nor taken the oath to the Pope. By 1555 the Edwardine bishops had been turned out. It was the Henrician bishops who were agitated in mind by Paul IV.’s proviso. What, then, was to be done but to ask the Pope to explain? He graciously condescended to do so; and issued the fifth and last of the documents before us, the *Breve Regimini Universalis*, on October 30, 1555. Its object was conciliatory, and it strove to reduce the number of doubtful cases within the narrowest possible limits.

‘Nos hesitationem hujusmodi tollere et serenitati conscientiarum qui schismate prædicto durante ad ordines promoti fuerunt mentem et intentionem quam in eisdem litteris nostris habuimus clarius exprimendo opportune consulere volentes [declaramus] eos tantum episcopos et archiepiscopos qui non in forma ecclesiæ ordinati et consecrati fuerunt rite et recte ordinatos dici non posse.’

Thus men’s minds were relieved. The later Henrician bishops were ‘duly and lawfully ordained,’ and so the orders of those whom they themselves had ordained are recognized too. Whether this was intended to declare the sufficiency of the Edwardine orders may be doubted. It certainly did not settle the invalidity of the Edwardine rite; for the decision proceeds on the principle that the validity of orders depends not on the validity of the rite used, but on the fitness or competence of the bishop employing it. The Ed-

¹ Cf. Lea, *Spiritual Jurisdiction*, and Stubbs, *Registr. Sacr.*

wardine Ordinal, if used by a bishop validly consecrated, conveys valid orders. It was for Pole and the Ordinaries to apply this principle in each case, remembering, however, that, while schism does not vitiate the competence of the Ordainer, consecration 'non in forma ecclesiæ' does. It remains, then, to ask what that phrase meant? The Letter Apostolic (§ 3, p. 11) will have it that the 'forma ecclesiæ' means the 'forma consueta,' the Ritual Form in the Pontifical, and concludes, therefore, that those bishops consecrated 'non in forma ecclesiæ' were the bishops consecrated according to the Edwardine Ordinal. Unless this were so 'the Pope would certainly have done nothing by these last letters for the removal of doubt . . . it was in this sense that the Legate understood the documents . . . and the same was done by Queen Mary.' But the difficulties attaching to this view are insuperable. First, Paul IV. would then be at issue with Julius III.; for while Julius III. allowed Pole to rehabilitate merely by way of dispensation in the case of those ordained 'non servata forma ecclesiæ consueta,' Paul IV. on this view commanded reordination. On this theory he disallowed the Edwardine rite, while Julius III. tacitly acquiesced in it. But, next, the Legate himself did not act upon this interpretation. He bade the bishops receive all who had been ordained 'dummodo . . . ecclesiæ forma et intentio sit servata,' where he certainly meant the 'Essential Form.' Thirdly, it involves plain absurdities. Paul IV. had condemned no ordinations but those bestowed 'ab alio quam episcopo rite et recte ordinato.' Now among ordinations undoubtedly conferred by bishops who were themselves duly consecrated must be reckoned such as were held, according to the Edwardine rite, by bishops who were consecrated after the Pontifical. Thus if Paul IV. rejected the bishops consecrated under the Edwardine Ordinal as consecrated 'non in forma ecclesiæ,' it follows that he rejected the Edwardine Ordinal for the consecration of bishops, but accepted it as a valid rite for the ordination of priests. But—and here comes in the absurdity—the Edwardine Ordinal departed much further from the Pontifical in its provisions for the ordination of priests and deacons than in the Order for the making of a Bishop. So say M. Boudinhon and Mgr. Gasparri.¹ Paul IV. then, according to the interpretation put upon his words in the Letter Apostolic, is at issue with the facts as observed by the best Roman Catholic scholars of to-day.

¹ Boudinhon, *De la Validité des Ordinations Anglicanes*, p. 85; Gasparri, *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, i. 488.

W
of Ju
Leo 2
satisf
tions
prom
rite, a
those
next,
beatif
defini
mislea
that t
of the
but, 'state
It is n
into t
were i

'T
secrete
those v
had th
to the
wardin
by one
not to
on of l

but ye
liam S
found
as Jul
equall
the do
the Ed
only i
that th
that th
they c
reconc

¹ Le
⁴ Th
W. H. K
book on
Articles

We conclude, then, that the explanation of the language of Julius III. and Paul IV., which the Letter Apostolic of Leo XIII. has adopted, cannot be sustained. It works unsatisfactorily, because it rests on two unwarranted assumptions: first, that in his reference to 'promoti' and 'non promoti' Julius must have had in mind the Edwardine rite, and so be alluding to two, and only two, classes of men, those who were and those who were not ordained by it;¹ next, that otherwise both he and Paul IV. would have been beating the air instead of dealing with a concrete and definite state of things.² But both these assumptions are misleading. The language of the documents makes it clear that the vital question to be asked and answered in the case of the English clergy was not, 'By what rite was I ordained?' but, 'By whom was I ordained?' And this accords with the state of affairs that the documents were designed to meet. It is not the fact that there was a definite cleavage of men into two classes easily recognizable. On the contrary, things were involved in great perplexity.

'There were, in the first place, those bishops who had been consecrated by the old rite before the breach with Rome; secondly, those who had been consecrated by the old rite after the breach, and had therefore neither received Papal confirmation nor taken the oath to the Pope; thirdly, those who had been consecrated by the Edwardine Ordinal; and, fourthly, the clergy who had been ordained by one or other of these classes, either by the old or the new rites—not to mention those who had merely received a presbyterian laying on of hands, or none at all.'³

but yet had obtained benefices like George Aynesworthe, William Saynt Barbe, and Thomas Burbanke, who was afterwards found 'dignus et idoneus,' and so was 'promoted' to orders, as Julius III.'s Breve directs.⁴ But the other assumption is equally unjustifiable, that, on any other reckoning than that the documents refer to men ordained and not ordained by the Edwardine rite, the two Popes and their Legate dealt only in vague generalities and settled nothing. It is true that they dealt in vague generalities; but it does not follow that they settled nothing. On the contrary, this was the way they chose to settle everything. Pole's was a mission of reconciliation. His policy, and that of his chief, was to

¹ Letter, § 3, p. 8.² *Ibid.* § 3, p. 7.³ *Treatise*, p. 12.⁴ The writer is indebted for these details to the kindness of the Rev. W. H. Frere, who has allowed him to see the proofs of his forthcoming book on the *Marian Reaction*, pp. 58 n. 2, 135 n. 1; cf. Forbes, XXXIX. Articles, p. 722, note c (ed. 4), for the abuse of laymen in benefices.

recognize as far as possible the *status quo*—to deal gently, and make the return to Rome as easy as could be. A copy of the Edwardine Prayer Book had been sent to Pole in June 1549,¹ and Julius III. knew the contents of the Ordinal in the summer of 1553. Yet the language of his instructions to his Legate is vague. Designedly so. He had to lay down a principle and leave Pole to apply it. It was a wide principle, made as elastic as possible; for nearly every cleric was more or less involved. But it met the circumstances. Under the guidance of a liberal rule laid down by the supreme authority each case could be taken on its merits, and dealt with by means of that local and personal knowledge which could only be possessed by the subordinate official on the spot. This was the course actually taken. Then Paul IV. was applied to and confirmed it; and of this confirmation we have unexceptionable evidence. For the continuator of Sanders, who had evidently seen the Bull and Breve of Paul IV. that are so new to us, in describing Pole's proceedings, says—

‘Episcopus omnes qui sententia religionis erant Catholici, in priore schismate factos, ac ipsos novos episcopatus (nam Henricus tempore schismatis sex erexerat) confirmavit, et hoc scriptum legi parliamentariæ conjunctum cum ceteris illorum comitiorum decretis publicatum est, et animi istorum placati sunt. Quæ omnia Pauli Quarti Pontificis Maximi litteris postea fuerunt stabilita et confirmata.’²

But if Paul IV. thus confirmed the proceedings of Pole it is certain that Pole and the Marian Bishops did not as a rule reordain the Edwardine clergy, but merely rehabilitate. Before the legate arrived a policy was instituted of supplying supposed deficiencies in the orders of Edwardine clergy. So the Queen directed in her Injunctions of March 4, 1554,³ and Bonner in his Visitation Articles of the same year.⁴ The contemporary evidence of Pilkington, afterwards Bishop of Durham, contains reminiscences, contemptuous indeed, but valuable, of what was done. Speaking in his commentary on Haggai of the use of oil, he says—

‘They would have us believe that the oil hath such holiness in it that whoever lacketh it is no priest or minister. Therefore, in the late days of Popery, our holy bishops called before them all such as were made ministers without such greasing, and blessed them with

¹ *State Papers, Dom.*, Edw. VI., vii. 28.

² Sanderus, *Orig. et Prog. Schism. Angl.*, edit. Romæ, 1586, p. 350.

³ Cardwell's *Documentary Annals*, i. 125.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 144.

the pope's blessing, anointed them, and then all was perfect: they might sacrifice for quick and dead.¹

Bonner, however, rehabilitated Scory, the only Edwardine bishop who conformed to the Marian *régime*, without more ado in July 1554.² There are, indeed, difficulties and inconsistencies to be found in these and other proceedings of Mary's reign. But in his study of the Episcopal Registers Mr. Frere has established these results.³ So far as can be discovered there were six bishops and one hundred and ten other clergy ordained under the Edwardine Ordinal, of whom seventy-one proceeded no further than the diaconate. Out of this whole number (1) many went into exile on Mary's accession, but (2) some were deprived early in 1554. 'The general cause of deprivation was marriage . . . there is no shadow of a hint that invalidity of Orders had anything to do with it.' Some, however, (3) conformed under Mary. Of these some presented themselves for reordination by the old Latin rite (which was not a supplementary, but 'a real reordination, implying an entire disbelief on the part of some one in the validity of the Edwardine Order'); but these reordinations, all but two, fall between December 1553 and May 1554, and appear to represent only private scruples belonging to a passing phase in the first panic of reaction. Other Edwardine clergy who conformed retained their benefices without any reordination at all. In the face of these facts, then, it cannot be maintained that, under instructions from Rome, Pole and his subordinates treated Edwardine Orders as null. No sooner were the first explanatory instructions issued than the day of reordinations was over. When we consider further that the language of his instructions is thrown into confusion by the supposition that Pole took Edwardine Orders to be null, it follows that the interpretation put upon them in the Letter Apostolic ignominiously breaks down. The Popes and their Legate in Mary's reign at least tolerated orders conferred according to the Edwardine rites. They were conciliatory then. They are not now. If so, to trace the origin of the later Roman practice of reordination to the documents of this period is also impossible. If Leo XIII. needed support for his recent decision by appeal to history, possibly he would have done better to confine himself to 'The Decree of Clement XI. and its Importance.'⁴ Let us see.

We may be brief about this.

¹ *Works*, Parker Society edition, p. 163.

² Pocock's *Burnet*, v. 389.

³ Cf. *The Marian Reaction*, c. 4.

⁴ Letter Ap. § 5.

'Soon after the opening of the commission,' says Mr. Lacey,¹ 'we learnt that the chief rock ahead was the Gordon decision. . . . It was said that Cardinal Mazzella, who presided over the sittings, forbade any attempt to go behind it. The commission, he said, was under the Holy Office; the commissioners were consultors of the Congregation, and could not revise the decree of their superiors.'

Whether this were so or not is of small moment; for before long the case passed into other hands. As the Pope frankly tells us, 'the Judges of the Supreme Council,' at 'a special meeting upon the Feria V., the 16th of July last . . . with one accord agreed that the question laid before them had already been adjudicated upon, with full knowledge of the Apostolic See.'² Leo XIII.'s, then, is no new decision at all, but only the old one of Clement XI. about Gordon. What, then, was Clement XI.'s decree? Hitherto all that has been

'known of it was due to Le Quien, who, in his reply to Courayer, published certain documents in the case obtained from the Holy Office. From these it appeared that John Gordon, Bishop of Galloway, ordained according to the English Rite, who had gone into exile with James II., petitioned the Holy See to declare his orders invalid.'³ In his petition he set out reasons for the invalidity, including a relation of the Nag's Head fable, a preposterous account of the English Forms of Ordination, and a very inadequate complaint against the intention of the English Bishops. The matter was referred to the Holy Office, and the Orders which Gordon had received were declared invalid.'⁴

This decree became at once of importance as ruling Roman practice; but, as it was seemingly based, not upon investigation of the case taken on its merits, but upon the statements of the petition, Clement XI.'s decision has hitherto been regarded as destitute of any theological or argumentative value. But we now learn from the Letter Apostolic of Leo XIII. that it really wears another aspect.

'In the delivery of the decision the Nag's Head story was altogether set aside, as documents of incontestable authenticity prove. Nor . . . was weight given to any other reason than the "defect of form and intention" . . . precaution was taken that a copy of the Anglican Ordinal should be submitted to examination, and that with it should be collated the Ordination forms gathered together from the various Eastern and Western rites. Then Cle-

¹ *Contemporary Review*, December 1896, p. 797.

² Letter, § 10, p. 22.

³ See the document in *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, i. 323, and cf. *De Hier. Angl.* § 277.

⁴ *Contemporary Review*, December 1896, p. 797.

ment X.
cerned
Gordon
to all th

In other
It is an
we may
lation of
really
ground
'upon
Anglica
He add
docume
writer i
the tex
the arc
the co
petition
text on
stateme
scriptur
was th
French
made, a
'dilate
of this
twenty
the 'scr
'acta'
but on
the rep
commis
discuss
and tha
ployed
brough
tribus
ordinat

¹ Let

² Cf.

³ Let

⁴ See

by Rev.

⁵ Let

ment XI. himself, with the unanimous vote of the cardinals concerned, on the Feria V. (April 17, 1704) decreed, "John Clement Gordon shall be ordained from the beginning and unconditionally to all the Orders."¹

In other words, we have here a doctrinal and a final decision. It is amusing to find² that finality belongs to Feria V.; and we may congratulate the Infallibilists engaged in the translation of the Bull that at last they have found something really 'irreformable.' But what are the exact doctrinal grounds on which the decision rests? It rests, says Leo XIII., 'upon the defect of form, which defect equally affects all' Anglican 'Ordinations.'³ Beyond that the Pope will not go. He adopts a tone of reserve, and points darkly to inaccessible documents. But these are beginning to come to light. A writer in the *Civiltà Cattolica* of November 11, 1896,⁴ gives the text of Clement XI.'s decree, as he has extracted it from the archives of the Holy Office. It differs considerably from the copies hitherto known. While they prefix Gordon's petition to the decree as if it formed part thereof, the new text only gives a brief summary of Gordon's arguments and statements. But it also introduces an allusion to 'quibusdam scripturis seu iuribus alias collectis pro simili casu.' This was the case, referred to in the recent Bull,⁵ 'of a certain French Calvinist' in 1684, in which investigations were made, and an adverse decision, though arrived at, ended in a 'dilatata'—i.e. was not pronounced. But the 'vota' and 'acta' of this case were 'called into use and considered again'⁶ twenty years later in the case of Gordon. They were, in fact, the 'scripturæ alias collectæ' of 1704. What, then, were these 'acta'? The writer in the *Civiltà* does not give them entire but only in provoking glimpses. Quoting apparently from the report of the proceedings of 1684 as presented to the commission of 1704, he says that 'the principal subject of discussion was the examination of the Edwardine "form," and that in the course of this examination the forms employed by the Easterns, whether Catholic or heretic, were brought up for comparison. In 1704, he adds, 'Duobus vel tribus novis votis fuit denuo demonstrata nullitas istarum ordinationum, potissimum ex insufficientia formæ.' What,

¹ Letter Ap. § 5, p. 14.

² Cf. Translators' note, Letter Ap. p. 14.

³ Letter, § 5, p. 13.

⁴ See *Guardian*, December 9, 1896, p. 1982, 'The Gordon Decision,' by Rev. T. A. Lacey, whose argument we summarize.

⁵ Letter Ap. § 4, p. 13.

⁶ *Ibid.* § 6, p. 13.

then, was taken to be the 'essential form'? Gordon himself, in his petition, took no account of 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' but pitched upon the delivery of the Bible as the 'matter,' and 'Take thou authority to preach,' &c., as the 'form.' It is clear, too, what he took as the 'form' in the Roman rite—viz. 'Accipe potestatem offerre'—for he says the English use 'nulla forma legitima; imo formam Catholicorum abjecere et commutavere in hanc "Accipe potestatem prædicandi." By no stretch of language could anything be *changed* into this but 'Accipe potestatem offerre.' But, as Estcourt observes (cf. p. 157), the petition would not represent merely the personal opinion of Gordon. It would be drawn up by, and represent the views of, men familiar with the official world of Rome at the time. They still took it in Rome that 'Accipe potestatem offerre' was the 'form' of the Roman rite; and accordingly 'Accipe potestatem prædicandi' would naturally appear to them the 'form' of the English rite. Was this, then, the outcome of 'the searching investigation' of the Anglican Ordinal which had taken place in 1684, when it was compared with Eastern as well as Western rites? Not improbably; for, as thus determined, the English 'form' would certainly strike an observer, to use Gordon's language, as one 'quæ essentialiter differt a formis orthodoxis.' But what a ludicrous and lame conclusion! If this was the form that was judged insufficient we do not mind. We can only wish that the 'investigation' had been a little more 'searching'; for, had they only gone over the ground a little more thoroughly, the officials who decided Gordon's case (April 17, 1704) would have noticed that the English Ordinal contained in 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum' the very words they had accepted as a valid 'form' in the case of the Abyssinian Ordinations, a week before (April 9, 1704). Thus it now turns out that Clement XI.'s doctrinal decision, lately reaffirmed with such an air of mystery as to the cogency of its reasons by Leo XIII., is simply based on an error of fact. Our inferences may be wrong. If so, let 'the documents of incontestable authenticity' be produced in their entirety, and we shall then be able to judge of the real grounds of Clement XI.'s decree and its importance.

But we must now turn to examine the reasons that the Pope does vouchsafe¹ when he proceeds to discuss the question on its merits. He holds, as we do, that 'the Anglican Ordinal is 'the essential point of the whole matter,'² a statement which agrees but ill with Paul IV.'s decision that those

¹ Letter Ap. §§ 7-9.

² *Ibid.* § 6.

orders
recte
they
how
trade
owned
There
consec
'Porre
accord
ordina
good r
tional
ments
Absolu
Benedi
Bull lo
argum
ceremo
still to
mind o
someth
we hav
peculia
prosely
a 'state
we can
plain th
a histo
even it
ground
second
to two
defectiv
We
also th
found c
by the
the out
outward

¹ Let
² Cf.
De Syno
¹ Let
² Let

orders were valid which were conferred by bishops 'rite et recte ordinati,' irrespective, as it appears, of the Ordinal which they employed. It is interesting also, in passing, to note how many of the objections which were once the stock in trade of Roman controversialists are dropped, or even disowned. The Nag's Head story is dismissed¹ with a sneer. There is no trace of any of the other objections to Parker's consecration. Barlow is not alluded to. The absence of the 'Porrectio Instrumentorum' would, it is now held, have involved, according to 'established custom,' merely a conditional reordination² in Gordon's case; though, we may add, there are good reasons for doubting whether, as early as 1704, conditional reordination in cases where the Tradition of the Instruments was omitted would have been all that was required. Absolute reordination was the rule in such cases, according to Benedict XIV., down to 1731-40,³ and the statement of the Bull looks like a blunder. Yet if it serves to dismiss any argument against our orders from the omission of the ceremony in question we are grateful. We are more grateful still to be told that 'the Church does not judge about the mind or intention' of the minister of orders 'in so far as it is something by its nature internal,'⁴ for now, it may be hoped, we have heard the last of those arguments derived from the peculiarities of ultra-Protestant bishops, so dear to the Roman proselytizer, whose first object is to insinuate a doubt and create a 'state of mind' in wavering Anglicans. For these concessions we cannot be too thankful to his Holiness. He has made it plain that the controversy is, as we said a year ago, no longer a historical but a theological one. By this last concession even its theological range has been greatly limited. 'The ground has now been cleared,' as Dr. Swete observes, 'of secondary questions, and the controversy is practically limited to two: are our ordinations defective in form? are they defective in intention?'⁵

We accept the scholastic terms 'matter' and 'form,' as also the doctrine that the signification of the rite is to be found chiefly in the 'form'; for the 'matter' is 'determined by the "form."' ⁶ Hooker also holds that 'to make complete the outward substance of a sacrament there is required an outward form, which form sacramental elements receive from

¹ Letter Ap. § 5, p. 13.² *Ibid.* § 5, p. 14.³ Cf. *Contemporary Review*, December 1896, p. 799, and Benedict XIV., *De Synodo Diœcesana*, Preface, and VIII. x. §§ 1, 12, 13.⁴ Letter Ap. § 9, p. 21.⁵ *On the Bull*, p. 12.⁶ Letter Ap. § 7, p. 16.

sacramental words.¹ We thankfully accept, too, the statement that 'in the Sacrament of Orders the "matter" . . . in so far as We have to consider it in this case, is the imposition of hands,'² and gladly leave Leo XIII., with a smile at his cautious reservation, to settle his differences on this point with Eugenius IV.'s *Decretum ad Armenos*: 'Presbyteratus traditur per calicis cum vino et patenæ cum pane porrectionem . . . et similiter de aliis per rerum ad ministeria sua pertinentium assignationem.'³ But when the whole case against the Anglican 'form' is that it is defective, because indeterminate, Leo XIII. ought to have made it clear, to start with, what is the 'form,' and what is the minimum of determinateness to be tolerated. He should have defined his test before he applied it to the English formularies. The Pope knew, as every scholar knows, that 'there is no one form of words which the Catholic Church has recognized as the one valid "form" of ordination';⁴ and he dared not set one up himself. He prefers to speak as if the doubt as to whether the 'form' be precatory or imperative were mainly entertained by Anglicans! 'The words which until recently were commonly held by Anglicans to constitute the proper form of priestly Ordination—namely, "Receive the Holy Ghost"—certainly do not in the least definitely express the Sacred Order of the Priesthood.'⁵

To take, then, what is still the 'communis sententia' among Roman theologians that the 'form' is imperative:⁶ The Anglican form, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' is said to be indefinite, and that on two grounds. One is the absence in the Edwardine Ordinal of the words 'for the office and work of a Priest,' from the insertion of which in the imperative 'form' of 1662 the Pope argues that Anglicans themselves must have 'perceived that the first form was defective.'⁷ But this inference rests simply on an historical blunder, and is one out of many signs of superficiality in the drafting of the Bull. The addition was made, not out of any consciousness that the Roman objections on this score were worth anything, but to mark off the distinction between the priesthood and the episcopate. It was adopted on the advice of Bishops Gunning

¹ *E. P. V.* lviii. 2.² Letter Ap. § 7, p. 16.³ Cf. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums*, p. 103, or Deuzinger, *Enchiridion*, p. 205, for text.⁴ *The Bull 'Ap. Cur.' and the Edw. Ordinal*, p. 5.⁵ Letter Ap. § 7, p. 16.⁶ Cf. Gasparri, *Tractatus Canonice de Sacra Ordinatione*, § 1109, vol. ii. p. 278.⁷ Letter Ap. § 7, p. 17.

and P
which
groun
again
does n
or its
cratin
in tha
fice of
langua
Leo X
... of
charac
Dr. Su
The b
again
untrue
and re
thee, b
spirit
it cont
mitted
In the
'Accip
of han
then, t
is less
impera
Roman
after t
'Accip
be con
its pos
the two
the 'P
century
first im
... im
ordinar
pare th
for the

¹ Cf.² Co³ *Ibi*

VOL.

and Pearson, to bar out that confusion between the two orders which was characteristic of Presbyterianism.¹ The other ground on which the charge of indeterminateness is made against our imperative 'form' looks, at first sight, graver. 'It does not definitely express the sacred order of the priesthood, or its grace and power, which is chiefly the power "of consecrating and of offering the true body and blood of the Lord,"² in that sacrifice which is "no nude commemoration of the sacrifice offered on the cross,"'³ 'It would appear, then,' if such language is to be demanded in an imperative 'form,' that Leo XIII. holds the clause "*Accipe potestatem offerre*," &c. . . . or some similar formula expressive of the sacrificial character of the presbyter, to be essential to the "form."⁴ So Dr. Swete, naturally enough, concludes.⁴ But this is absurd. The best answer to the charge of indeterminateness lodged against the imperative 'form' is simply to point out that it is untrue to fact. For a Bishop it ran, 'Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee, by imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness.' Thus it contains words from 2 Tim. i. 6, 7, where St. Paul is admittedly referring to Timothy's consecration to the episcopate. In the Roman Pontifical, at the consecration of a Bishop, '*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*' stands alone at the imposition of hands, without the addition of any defining words. So far, then, the Edwardine 'form' for the consecration of a Bishop is less indeterminate than the Roman. Similarly, so far as imperative 'forms' go, in the ordination of a Priest. In the Roman rite the new priests are called '*ordinati*' immediately after the '*Accipe potestatem offerre*,' and long before the '*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*.' Neither of these formulæ can be considered essential to the 'form'; the latter because of its position at the end of the service and of its absence up to the twelfth century, the former because it only came in with the '*Porrectio Instrumentorum*,' toward the end of the tenth century. We must look, then, for an imperative form at the first imposition of hands. But what do we find? '*Pontifex . . . imponit simul utramque manum super caput cujuslibet ordinandi successive, nihil dicens*.' There is no need to compare the imperative form in use by the Edwardine Ordinal for the ordination of a Priest. It cannot certainly be less in-

¹ Cf. Blunt's *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, p. 691.

² Council of Trent, Sess. xxiii. c. 1.

³ *Ibid.* Sess. xxii. c. 3; Letter Ap. § 7, p. 16. ⁴ *On the Bull*, p. 14.

why?

determinate than an imposition of hands without a word to accompany it at all.

But the characteristic grace and power of the priesthood must find expression somewhere. If the Edwardine imperative 'forms' are determinate enough by comparison with the Roman, there still remains the taint of indeterminateness, it is said, about 'the other prayers of the same Ordinal,'¹ i.e. the precatory 'forms.' It avails us nothing to appeal to them, for 'let this argument suffice for all: from them has been deliberately removed whatever sets forth the dignity and office of the priesthood in the Catholic rite. . . . The same holds good of Episcopal Consecration.'² As there is nothing in the formula 'Take the Holy Ghost,' so there is nothing in 'the prayer of the preface, "Almighty God,"' equal to the expression 'summum sacerdotium' of the Pontifical. It has been stripped of all such words. The offence is that sacrificial expressions are not only absent from the 'form'; they have been taken out.

The history of the precatory 'forms,' then, demands our attention next. In the Edwardine Ordinal for the Ordering of Priests and the Consecration of Bishops there were, in each of these services, two prayers beginning respectively, 'Almighty God, giver of all good things' and 'Almighty God and' (for priests) 'heavenly' or (for bishops) 'most merciful Father.' The former of these stands in the same terms in both offices but for the change of 'Thy servant now called to the office of the Priesthood' into 'Thy servant now called to the work and ministry of a Bishop.' It corresponds *quoad substantiam*, according to Mgr. Gasparri, 'with the prayers employed or approved by the Church.'³ It represents the prefatory prayer of the Pontifical, which in turn runs back to the 'Deus bonorum omnium' or 'Consecratio' of the Gelasian Sacramentary.⁴ It more than satisfies the minimum requirements which the Abbé Boudinhon has deduced from a comparison of the ancient ordination precatory forms.⁵ But in the Edwardine Ordinal it was separated from the laying on of hands by a considerable interval—in the Ordering of Priests by the Examination and the prayer 'Almighty God and heavenly Father'; in the Consecration of Bishops by the Examination, the 'Veni Creator,' and the prayer 'Almighty God and most merciful Father.' Difficulties were felt by some friendly critics on the score of these lengthy observances

¹ Letter Ap. § 7, p. 17.

² *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, i. 556.

³ *Validité*, &c., p. 50.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 17.

⁵ Ed. Wilson, p. 151.

inter
Edw
thes
Lug
requ
the
inter
to a
pain
valid
pray
have
are
Such
rite

pray
they
conf
pow

'Alm
'form
now
calle
insuf
both
the r
in re
whic
early
omni
eader
excep
with
'Alm
ful F
imme
may

¹ M
² L
³ I
⁴ C
Texte
⁵ 1
⁷ J

intervening between the 'form' and the 'matter' in the Edwardine Ordinal, as, for instance, by M. Boudinhon.¹ But these were set aside by Mgr. Gasparri² with reference to De Lugo, who lays down, what common sense would seem to require, that the whole ordination service is morally one and the same action³—'*eadem actio moraliter continuatur absque interruptione morali.*' Leo XIII., moreover, seems disposed to acquiesce in the reasonableness of this view; for he is at pains to put out of court by anticipation any plea for the validity of our Orders that might be derived from 'the other prayers of the Ordinal'⁴ generally. But this he need only have done on the assumption that all the prayers of the rite are morally connected with each other and with the 'matter.' Such objections, then, as are drawn from the sequence of the rite we may confidently dismiss.

But, again, fault is found with the substance of these prayers. They are condemned as indeterminate, first, because they contain no mention, as is alleged, of the order to be conferred, and, secondly, because they omit all allusion to the power of offering sacrifice.

The first of these objections is easily met. If the prayer 'Almighty God, giver of all good things,' be taken as the 'form,' then there is distinct mention in it of 'Thy servants now called to the office of Priesthood,' and 'Thy servant now called to the work and ministry of a Bishop.' If it be thought insufficient that prayer should be made in identical terms both for Bishop and Priest, *mutatis mutandis* only as to the name of the office to be bestowed; it is enough to quote in reply the precedent afforded by the Canons of Hippolytus, which give the form of ordination used in the Roman Church early in the third century. '*Si autem ordinatur presbyter, omnia cum eo similiter agantur ac cum episcopo. . . . Etiam eadem oratio super eo oretur tota ut super episcopo, cum sola exceptione nominis episcopatus.*'⁵ If, again, it be preferred, with M. Boudinhon⁶ and Mgr. Gasparri,⁷ to treat the prayer 'Almighty God and heavenly' or (for Bishops) 'most merciful Father' as the 'form,' because in both rites it stood in immediate connexion with the imposition of hands, then we may observe that, after reciting the various grades of the

¹ *Validité*, p. 57.

² *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, pp. 546 and 556.

³ *De Sac. in Gen. Disp.* ii. § v. n. 99; cf. Puller, *The Bull*, &c., p. 15.

⁴ *Letter Ap.* § 7, p. 17.

⁵ *Canones Hippolyti*, ed. Achelis, p. 61, *ap.* Gebhardt und Harnack, *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, vi. 4.

⁶ *Validité*, &c., pp. 53 *sqq.*

⁷ *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, i. 553 and 555.

Apostolic ministry, it speaks of the ordinands to the priesthood as 'Thy servants here present,' called 'to the same office and ministry,' and, in respect of the Bishop to be consecrated, prays 'for this Thy servant such grace that he may evermore be ready to spread abroad Thy Gospel,' as the original Apostles, prophets, &c., did. It is interesting to notice that the language of this prayer for the Bishop recalls the terms of a passage that now stands in the preface of the Roman Pontifical ('Sint speciosi . . . consequantur'), as it also appeared in the Gelasian Consecratio,¹ but is not in the Leonine or old Roman, being of Gallican origin.² But, ancient as it is, the language of the prayer in question for the Consecration of a Bishop, as also of the corresponding prayer for the Ordering of a Priest, does not, it must be confessed, make explicit mention of the order, in either case, to be conferred. Again, the Canons of Hippolytus stand us in good stead. There the form for the Ordering of a Deacon does not actually mention the diaconate, but merely prays for 'servum tuum N. eumque prepares cum illis, qui tibi serviunt secundum tuum beneplacitum sicut Stephanus.'³ An express mention of the order to be conferred, therefore, cannot be required in the precatory form, provided the reference be sufficiently indicated otherwise. In the Edwardine prayer before us it is made clear enough that the Apostolic orders are being renewed. The rest of the service determines with ample precision which particular order is being conveyed at the moment.

Yet what are we to say of the absence of any mention of the power to offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice? The Pope gives his imprimatur to the one-sided conception of the priesthood long current in Roman teaching. This 'power of offering the true body and blood of the Lord' is that which 'sets forth the dignity and office of the priesthood in the Catholic Rite.' This is 'what it ought essentially to signify.'⁴ Now there, is no such thing and never was any such thing, as one 'Catholic Rite.' By this question-begging term is meant, we suppose, the Roman rite and such rites as the Roman Church has accepted. These rites have been conveniently collected, to the number of eight, by M. Boudinhon.⁵ He should have added that given in the Canons of Hippolytus, which makes nine in all. What references, then, to power of offering sacrifice do the 'forms' of these rites contain?

¹ Cf. Wilson, p. 151.

² Cf. Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 347.

³ Achelis, *ut supra*, p. 66.

⁴ Letter Ap. § 7, pp. 16, 17. ⁵ *Validité*, pp. 24 sqq.

Taking first the six Eastern 'forms,' we observe that in the rites for the Ordination of Priests the following are the chief specimens of sacrificial language :

(1) Greek : τοῦτον . . . ἵνα γένηται ἄξιος . . . προσφέρειν σοι δῶρα καὶ θυσίας πνευματικὰς.¹

(2) Maronite : 'Concede illi ut dignus fiat qui . . . honoret thronum tuum sanctum ibique offerat sacrificia perfecta et dona spiritualia.'

(3) Nestorian : 'Respice . . . ut . . . inserviant altari tuo sancto, offerentes tibi oblationes orationum et sacrificia confessionum.'

(4) The Coptic (5), the Armenian, and (6) the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions make no mention of sacrifice, but use general terms such as 'opera sacerdotii' (4), 'Peragat terribile et sanctum sacramentum corporis sanguinisque Domini' (5), and 'Pro populo tuo sacra rite et sine vitio operetur' (6).

Obviously, then, the power of offering the Eucharistic sacrifice has not been explicitly put forward in the Eastern 'forms' of Ordination to the priesthood, reckoning back from the rites still in use to, at least, a period before the latter half of the fourth century, the date of the compilation of the Apostolic Constitutions, which entomb the earliest Syrian rites.² The power of offering any sacrifice at all is only mentioned in some rites ; in others it is obscurely alluded to ; in others, again, not at all.

On turning to review the Western rites of Ordination to the Priesthood, we find a similar absence of sacrificial phraseology in their 'forms.' In the Roman Pontifical there stands one clear reference to the power of offering the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the 'Accipe potestatem offerre,' &c. But it is not the 'form,' and only came in when the 'Traditio Instrumentorum,' which had been in use from high antiquity for the lower orders,³ was adopted, possibly under the growing influence of feudal ideas, in the bestowal of the priesthood about the tenth century. In the *Codex S. Eligii*, of the tenth (or possibly ninth) century, we find, at the vesting with the chasuble, the words, 'ut offeras placabiles hostias pro peccatis atque offensionibus populi omnipotenti Deo.'⁴ So in an Anglo-Saxon manuscript of the eleventh century⁵ there ap-

¹ Cf. Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus*, iv. 558.

² Cf. Brightman, *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*, vol. i. pp. xvii. sqq.

³ Cf. *Statuta Ecclesie Antiqua*, a code of Gallican customs of about the beginning of the sixth century, ap. Gasparri, *Tract. Canon. de Sacr. Ord.* ii. 341.

⁴ Cf. Morinus, *De Sacris Ordinationibus*, p. 222, ed. Antwerpiae, MDCLXXXV.; Delisle, *Mémoire sur d'Anciens Sacramentaires*, Paris, 1886, p. 175 ; Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, note C, pp. 367-8.

⁵ Delisle, p. 220.

pears at the 'consecratio manuum,' which is a ceremony of ninth-century origin¹ and Gallican provenance, this phrase: 'ad consecrandas hostias quæ pro delictis atque negligentibus populi offeruntur.'² Lastly, in a twelfth (?) century manuscript appears the 'Porrectio Instrumentorum,' with 'Accipe potestatem offerre,' &c.³ It was these additions which for the first time brought any mention of the Eucharistic Oblation into the Roman rite. In the precatory 'forms' to this day there is no such reference to the power of 'offering the true body and blood of the Lord in that sacrifice'⁴; but there is a reference to the power of 'consecrating' the same, and this ours lack. It occurs in the prayer, 'Deus sanctificationum' of the Pontifical, and now reads 'ut . . . in obsequium plebis tuæ, panem et vinum in corpus et sanguinem Filii tui immaculata benedictione transformetur; et inviolabili charitate in virum perfectum,' &c. This prayer is the seventh of the eight quoted above from M. Boudinhon. It is undoubtedly ancient. It represents the Gallican 'form' and is of Gallican origin, standing, as it does, for the 'Benedictio' in a book which, though commonly known as the Gelasian Sacramentary, is really a collection of Roman rites with Gallican additions, belonging, in its present form, to c. 628-731.⁵ But in the Gelasian Sacramentary, the words 'panem et vinum in' are wanting, and the sentence runs 'ut . . . per obsequium plebis tui corpus et sanguinem Filii tui immaculata benedictione transformetur,'⁶ &c. Nor is this all. In the Anglo-Saxon manuscript alluded to above as of the eleventh century, another remarkable variation appears, 'ut . . . per obsequium plebis tuæ, corpore et sanguine Filii tui, immaculata benedictione transformetur ad inviolabilem charitatem et in virum perfectum.'⁷ If Anglicans are to be charged with taking old words, such as 'priest' and 'bishop,' in a new sense,⁸ nothing can be clearer than that between the tenth and the sixteenth century 'serious changes had occurred . . . which had the effect of putting a new construction upon the meaning of the old words.'⁹ The further we go back the more that type of phrase which the Pope deems of such absolute necessity disappears. The prayer for the transformation of the elements by consecration was originally but a prayer for the transformation of the

¹ Duchesne, *Origines*, p. 356 n.

² Morinus, *op. cit.* p. 233; cf. a Sens MS. of the tenth century, *ibid.* p. 241, and the *Codex Ravoldi*, *ibid.* p. 248.

³ Morinus, *op. cit.* p. 274.

⁴ Letter Ap. § 7, p. 16.

⁵ Cf. Duchesne, *Origines*, pp. 119 *sqq.*

⁶ Ed. Wilson, p. 24.

⁷ Morinus, *op. cit.* p. 233.

⁸ Cf. Letter Ap. § 8, p. 20.

⁹ Swete, *On the Bull*, &c., p. 17.

priest
the I
signe
usage
consec
on hi
Ponti
allude
'ut a
suffice
the e
'in th
tion o
Eucha
"accip
noctua
and th
reticere
moder
ment.'

T
Angli
the su
the E
not in
body
if the
Order
witho
them
Order

B
Pope
langu
front
injust
attem
posed
of sac
we un
quite

¹ D
says se
² D
⁴ S
⁵ I

priest 'into a perfect man.' So in the purely Roman rites of the Leonine Sacramentary, which, in its present form, is assigned to a date after the sixth century,¹ but probably gives the usages of the local Roman Church of earlier days, the only consecrating 'form' is that which M. Boudinhon gives first on his list, the 'Deus bonorum omnium,' still preserved in the Pontifical. But as far as sacrificial language goes it merely alludes to the grace which God gave to the sons of Aaron: 'ut ad hostias salutare et frequentioris officii sacramenta sufficeret meritum sacerdotum.'² Going back further still to the earliest of extant Roman Ordinals, we find that

'in the Canons of Hippolytus the prayers prescribed for the ordination of both bishops and presbyters contain no reference to the Eucharist, unless it be included in the perfectly general words, "accipe orationes ejus et oblationes ejus quas tibi offeret die noctuque."³ . . . The truth is that the further we ascend the stream, and the nearer we approach to Apostolic sources the greater is the reticence of the forms of ordination upon the very points which modern Rome considers to be essential to the efficacy of the Sacrament.'⁴

To sum up as to the alleged defective 'form' in the Anglican Ordinal: The Roman Church has acknowledged the sufficiency of all the ordinals of East and West save one, the English Ordinal. Ours the Pope rejects, because it does not in so many words confer 'the power of offering the true body and blood of the Lord.' But neither do the rest; and if the "form" ought essentially to signify 'this power, then Orders conferred according to the Roman rites, which were without any such language for nine hundred years, were themselves invalid. Rome in her haste to condemn our Orders has condemned her own.

But stay! We do not, it will be said, represent the Pope's meaning fairly. It is not the mere absence of such language, but its elimination that he makes 'the head and front of our offending.' True; and we should do him an injustice if we did not deal with this charge. Before he attempts to discuss 'the mind and aim of those who composed the Anglican Ordinal'⁵ he complains that all mention of sacrificial functions has been 'deliberately removed.'⁶ As we understand him its mere withdrawal from the 'form,' quite apart from the intention with which it was withdrawn,

¹ Duchesne, *Origines*, p. 128 sqq.; Delisle (*Mémoires*, &c., p. 65) says seventh.

² Duchesne, *Origines*, p. 345.

³ Achelis, p. 46.

⁴ Swete, *On the Bull*, &c., pp. 17, 18.

⁵ Letter Ap. § 8.

⁶ *Ibid.* § 7, p. 17.

constitutes a fatal defect. Now it is obvious, from the history just given of sacrificial terminology in Ordinals, that the Pope, in condemning ours for the lack of it, would have condemned his own, had he not had this further plea to take refuge in. He might, indeed, have urged that once such expressions had found their way into Western Ordinals generally, it was beyond the power of any local Church to go back upon them. But he did not; he is too well informed. He suggests it in the meaning which he seems to attach to the term 'the Catholic rite,' as if one Ordinal had been generally and deliberately adopted by some common authority. But he goes no further. He knows that Ordinals were many and various; the local Churches each had its own. They borrowed from each other, as the Roman rite borrowed from the English, in the ninth or tenth centuries, the anointing of the hands,¹ the delivery of the Gospels to deacons,² and the crossing of the stole.³ St. Gregory himself, in his advice to St. Augustine,⁴ recognized the right of local Churches to frame their own services. The *jus liturgicum* was once exercised freely by each bishop, and it seems that, just as the 'prophets' in the *Διδάχῃ* consecrated the Eucharist 'ὅσα θέλουσιν,'⁵ so there was once 'a time when the bishop might still confer the blessing of Orders with whatever form he pleased.'⁶ Further, the different variations and additions, whether in rite or ceremony, crept in at different times in different Churches by the action of the local bishops. Thus 'Accipe potestatem offerre,' &c., began to appear in the tenth century. The Roman rite itself was adopted quite voluntarily by other Churches in the West. They felt themselves at liberty to treat it as their own. The English Pontifical added the prayer 'Pater Sancte Omnipotens Deus' in the Consecration of Bishops.⁷ The 'Veni Creator' first appeared in the eleventh century in the Church of Soissons.⁸ 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum' worked its way to recognition slowly and gradually from the twelfth century onwards;⁹ and neither in the case of this formula nor in that which accompanied the 'Porrectio' must it be supposed that because they became all but universal they must have been adopted in obedience to some central authority. If this be so, it is obvious that what a local Church, or even diocese, had

¹ Duchesne, *ut supra*, p. 356 n.² Maskell, *Mon. Rit.* ii. 210. ³ *Ibid.* ii. 219.⁴ Bede, *H. E.* i. 27.⁵ Chap. x. *ap. Schaff's Oldest Church Manual*, p. 198.⁶ *Treatise*, p. 24 n. and refs.⁷ Maskell, *Mon. Rit.* ii. 281. ⁸ *Ibid.* ii. 223.⁹ Cf. thirteenth-century MSS. in Morinus, *op. cit.* p. 279.

power
by ado
of the
Apostl
innovat
the Po
He fal
sacrific
authori
he seen
Cathol
Anglic
the one
the oth
ground
term.
adopte
whole
beyond
nay, th
draw it
locus st
assertio
of the
Cathol
hazard
truth i
the wit
first wa
But, th
restate
truth?
fundam
appeal
press h
the cor
had be
words
in spite
langua
forms l

But

¹ Pu² Cf.

xxix. 18.

power to add it had power to reject. If the English bishops by adopting the 'Porrectio' 'had the right to alter the matter of the Sacrament of Order, as it had come down from the Apostles, they had *a fortiori* the right to abrogate the later innovation and return to Apostolic and Catholic usage.'¹ But the Pope does not avail himself of this plea. He is too wise. He falls back simply upon the fact of the withdrawal of sacrificial language, which, by whatever process and whatever authority, had certainly once been there. To take a parallel, he seems to say, there is a 'Catholic Rite,' as there is also a Catholic Creed, each with its distinctive phraseology. Anglicans, in withdrawing the characteristic expressions of the one, put themselves in the position of those opponents of the other who claimed to go behind the *ὁμοούσιον* on the ground that it was neither a primitive nor a Scriptural term. But the comparison will not hold. *Ὁμοούσιον* was adopted deliberately in an Ecumenical Council by the whole Church, with a full consciousness that, though going beyond the terms of Scripture, it was the strict equivalent—nay, the only possible preservative—of its sense. To withdraw it, therefore, would have been *ipso facto* to give error a *locus standi*, and so to imperil the faith. But not one of these assertions is true of the introduction and later abandonment of the sacrificial language in the Ordinal. There is no one Catholic rite. The terms in question were adopted at hazard, and with no such object as that of guarding essential truth from infection of error. Provided only, then, that, in the withdrawal, what was acknowledged as essential from the first was still retained, the withdrawal is beyond reproach. But, then, may you for any purpose, even a good one, thus restate your beliefs and expressions so as to recover essential truth? Rome stoutly denies it. She forbids the appeal to fundamentals: and here we differ; for this is exactly the appeal that St. Athanasius invariably recurs to. He does not press his opponents with the *ὁμοούσιον*; he meets them on the common ground of Scriptural terminology² even when it had been exceeded. Like a true reconciler, he looks through words to ideas, and is willing to accept as Catholic all who, in spite of a claim to go behind the *ὁμοούσιον* to primitive language, believe *bona fide* that the Son is God. The English forms have restated but never denied the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

But the Pope anticipates any such appeal to the ancient

¹ Puller, *The Bull 'Ap. Cur.'* &c., p. 33.

² Cf. *Orations against the Arians*, I. ix. 9 (ed. Bright), I. lii. 55, III. xxix. 184. The *ὁμοούσιος* only occurs once in Or. I.—III.

models by a charge of constructive heresy. The framers of the Ordinal,

'under a pretext of returning to the primitive form . . . corrupted the liturgical Order in many ways to suit the errors of the reformers. For this reason in the whole ordinal not only is there no clear mention of the sacrifice of the sacerdotium, and of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifice, but every trace of these things which had been in such prayers of the Catholic rite as they had not entirely rejected was deliberately removed and struck out.'

It is obvious, however, that this is a charge not against the sufficiency of the 'form,' but against the intention of the whole rite. To this we now proceed. In the Pope's eyes it is the real ground for the condemnation of the English Ordinal. 'Vitiating in its origin,'¹ it is held to be vitiated in its effect. 'Any words in the Anglican Ordinal, as it now is, which lend themselves to ambiguity cannot be taken in the same sense as they possess in the Catholic rite.' Low Churchmen are 'the more shrewd Anglican interpreters of the Ordinal.' The rite is 'wholly insufficient to confer Orders.'²

The Pope dismisses all reference to the private opinions of the individual bishops who confer Orders,³ and on the general doctrine of intention he appears to be at one with Hooker⁴ and common sense.

'The Church does not judge about the mind and intention in so far as it is something by its nature internal; but in so far as it is manifested externally she is bound to judge it. When anyone has rightly and seriously made use of the due form and the matter requisite for effecting or conferring the Sacrament, he is considered by the very fact to do what the Church does. On this principle rests the doctrine that a Sacrament is truly conferred by the ministry of one who is a heretic or unbaptized, provided the Catholic rite be employed.'⁵

Individual bishops, then, may hold heretical opinions, and yet their ordinations may be good. If, however, the rite they employ be not that which the Church approves—much more if it have been changed 'with the manifest intention of introducing another rite not approved by the Church, and of rejecting what the Church does'⁶—they cannot be supposed to have the intention requisite. But this is the position in which all Anglican bishops are placed by their use of the English Ordinal. Therefore Anglican Orders are 'absolutely null and utterly void.'⁷

¹ Letter, § 8, p. 19.

² *Ibid.* § 9, p. 21.

³ Letter Ap. § 9, p. 21.

⁴ *Ibid.* § 8, pp. 19, 20.

⁵ *E. P. V.* lviii. 3.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.* § 10, p. 22.

To
how the
constru
to what
he had
—e.g. th
made i
was an
seems t
For H
'the rul
rather
A.D. 40
those w
tion, th
so, wha
all this,
really '
the tim
authors
motives
simply
express
structiv
too. T
referenc
'tedious
simply
Yet, as
lacking
Roman
its abse
form its
tive sen
defect o
of negat
circle.

But,
must be
the Eng
by the
'rejectin

¹ *Hist.*

² Lett

³ Cf. 1

⁴ Cf. 6

To weigh the value of this conclusion, it should be noticed how the charge of heretical intention is built up. It is purely constructive. The Pope forbids Anglicans to have recourse to what is the plainest of historical facts, that Cranmer, while he had no objection to retaining mediæval accretions as such—e.g. the 'Veni Creator' and the 'Accipe Spiritum Sanctum'—made it his main object to recur to the primitive forms. He was an eager student of ecclesiastical antiquity, and it seems that he had before him the *Statuta Ecclesiæ Antiqua*. For Heylin records that the revisers of the Ordinal took 'the rules of the Primitive Church as they are recapitulated rather than ordained in the Fourth Council of Carthage, A.D. 401';¹ and if we compare the rites there prescribed with those which our Ordinal retains as the essentials of ordination, this statement would seem to be borne out by fact. If so, what becomes of the charge of perverse intention? But all this, says Leo XIII., was mere 'pretext.' All was done really 'to suit the errors of the reformers.' 'The history of the time is sufficiently eloquent as to the animus of the authors of the Ordinal.' And for summary proof of the bad motives which reigned and gained the day, reference is simply made to the 'deliberate removal' of the requisite expressions in the rite.² Such an argument, if merely constructive, has also this further vice that it is merely negative too. The alleged anti-Catholic animus is not proved by reference to historical detail; such detail is denounced as 'tedious' and 'unnecessary.' The defect of intention is simply inferred from the employment of a defective 'form.'³ Yet, as has been shown, what is lacking in our 'form' is lacking also in other admittedly valid 'forms,' the ancient Roman 'forms' included. In ours, then, the fault lies not in its absence but in its removal. It is attributed not to the form itself, but to the employment of it in a new and defective sense. In other words, the defect of form results from a defect of intention.⁴ And so this argument, constructed out of negations to begin with, ends up appropriately in a vicious circle.

But, however arrived at, the charge of defective intention must be met. What is its exact shape? The Pope regards the English rite of Ordination as 'another rite not approved by the Church,' introduced with the manifest intention of 'rejecting what the Church does.'⁵ It is, in fact, a new kind

¹ *History of the Reformation*, p. 83.

² Letter Ap. § 8, p. 19.

³ Cf. *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, iii. 598.

⁴ Cf. *Cont. Rev.* December 1896, p. 796.

⁵ Letter Ap. § 9, p. 21.

of rite. It introduces therefore a new sort of ministry. And so every one who has used it can only have used it in this sense. He cannot make bishops, priests, and deacons, in the old sense of the words, as recognized in the Catholic Church. He cannot, in effect, rise above the level of 'intention' expressed in the Ordinal itself. This objection is indeed a very subtle one. If we have grasped the Pope's meaning rightly, we have not here to deal with any objection to the rite itself. That has been already reviewed. Nor have we to deal with charges of inadequate intention on the part of those who use the Ordinal. It is held that, apart from any defect in the rite itself, and apart from any defect of intention in the minister of Ordination,

'the rite must be interpreted by reference to the supposed defect of intention on the part of those who drew it up: and that this alleged defect of intention, as shown by their "changing the rite" and "introducing another," invalidates all orders conferred by that rite.'¹

as a sort of 'peccatum originis' infecting all.

We are content to reply briefly as follows:

First, the charge is a painfully disingenuous one. The Preface to the Ordinal sets forth its intention as clearly as could be wished. It begins by enumerating the ancient Orders of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon. It speaks of the reverence in which they were held, and teaches that men can be admitted to them only 'by public prayer with imposition of hands.' Are these Orders, then, to be swept away, and a new sort of ministry introduced? Far from it. 'To the intent these Orders should be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in this Church of England, it is requisite that no man (not being at this present Bishop, Priest, nor Deacon) should execute any of them, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted, according to the form hereafter following.' Here the intention of the Ordinal is formally and deliberately expressed. Why will not the Pope take the English Church at her word? How can her intention to perpetuate the same Orders as before be gainsaid? How can it be urged, with any show of fairness, that, even supposing the framers of the Ordinal entertained heretical tenets on certain points, their private opinions can weigh at all against their public and solemn declaration that they intended to set up no new orders, but to continue the same as had existed up to their own day? How, too, can it be seriously held

¹ *Treatise*, p. 37.

that the o
promised
Ordinal a
genuous o

But, s
whole Or
is no clea
able that
to render
there neve
but 'pries
Ordinal.

'Nobo
was the tra
uniformly
presbyter.¹
the *sacerdos*
greatest ab
can signify

We ac
of 'offerin
other vali
the withd
is not ec
without c
In the tea
of the pro
Eucharist
they still
Ordinal p
pensing t
misses, it
to endang
in favour
Priestho
was nece
erroneous
sacrifice
eyes. Fa
Canus an

¹ Cf. D.
² Cf. Pe
pp. 94 n 1
³ *Treat*
⁴ *The L*

that the opinions attributed to them have ever since compromised the action of those who have accepted and used the Ordinal after them? An argument like this is either disingenuous or else merely absurd!

But, secondly, it is based on misstatements. 'In the whole Ordinal,' says the Letter Apostolic (§ 8, p. 19), 'there is no clear mention of . . . the *sacerdotium*.' It is remarkable that the translators have carefully avoided the attempt to render *sacerdotium* into English. There is not now, and there never has been, any word for it in the English language but 'priesthood.' 'Priest' occurs over and over again in the *Ordinal*.

'Nobody at that time would have dreamt of saying that "priest" was the translation of presbyter, and not of sacerdos. "Priest" is uniformly used as the translation of sacerdos, and "elder" as that of presbyter.¹ Above all, the extreme reformers who actually did deny the *sacerdotium*, rejected also the English word "priest" with the greatest abhorrence.² So the retention of the word in the ordinal can signify nothing but the intention of conferring the *sacerdotium*.³

We admit, of course, that there is no mention of the power of 'offering sacrifice.' There is none, as we have seen, in other valid rites. But the offence of our Ordinal lies in the withdrawal of such allusion. What then? Withdrawal is not equivalent to denial. It was in this case made without compromising essential truth and on good grounds. In the teaching of the Mediæval Church the sacrificial duties of the presbyter or bishop, and the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist, had acquired an exaggerated prominence which they still retain in the mind of modern Rome. Because our Ordinal prefers to use such phrases as 'ministering' or 'dispensing the Sacraments,' in place of those which the Pope misses, it does not follow that the English Church intended to endanger the Faith, or to do more than redress the balance in favour of a wider, juster, and more primitive view of the Priesthood and Sacraments. And to see that such a step was necessary we have only to glance at specimens of erroneous teaching emphasizing the satisfactory nature of the sacrifice of the Mass, which the Reformers had before their eyes. Father Puller quotes Vasquez, and refers to Melchior Canus and Suarez for evidence.⁴ In a former number of this

¹ Cf. Dr. Wordsworth's *Responsio ad Batavos*, pp. 13, 14, for proofs.

² Cf. Penry's language, ap. Denny's *Anglican Orders and Jurisdiction*, pp. 94 n 1; 103 n 5; 203.

³ *Treatise*, &c., p. 39.

⁴ *The Bull 'Ap. Cur.'* &c. pp. 40, 41.

*Review*¹ we have amply shown the prevalence of similar opinions. Enough now to borrow from Father Puller an apposite quotation from Cajetan.

'The common error of many shows itself in this, that they think that this sacrifice [of the altar] has a certain definite amount of merit, or makes a certain definite amount of satisfaction *ex opere operato*, which is applied to this person or to that person.'²

The doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice was, in fact, in a state of utter confusion. Men no longer distinguished between a sacrifice which was effectual by way of impetration in union with the Heavenly Self-Oblation of our Lord and sacrifices satisfactory which, as Gardiner said, amounted to a 'new redemption',³ and so imperilled the uniqueness of the 'redemptio propitiatio et satisfactio' once for all made upon the Cross. These were 'dangerous deceits' indeed (Art. XXXI), and if Cranmer, when translating the ancient services into the vulgar tongue for popular use, hesitated to reproduce certain mediæval phrases which, though innocuous in themselves, had thus become encrusted with a new and distorted sense, can he be fairly accused of an heretical intention, or of an intention sufficient to vitiate the entire Ordinal for good? The Bull asks us to believe that, because Cranmer and other revisers 'associated themselves with abettors from the heterodox sects,'⁴ therefore they went as far as those sects in the repudiation of Catholic truth. This is not true. While denying that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is 'propitiatory' in the sense of what Dr. Mozley would call 'an original as distinct from a borrowed propitiation,'⁵ he never joined the extreme Protestants in denying that it was a sacrifice at all. In 1551, after the publication of the first Ordinal, he wrote: 'I say that there is a sacrifice; but that the same is propitiatory for the remission of sin neither I nor the Council do so say.'⁶ Nothing can be clearer than that in omitting phrases which, after many centuries, had crept into, but had now become, after nearly as many more, characteristic of, the Pontifical, Cranmer's mind was not to reject but to restore the faith. But to go back to fundamentals is what Rome cannot forgive. She cannot forgive us for declining to go with her where she exceeds the teaching of the New Testament and of the Ancient Church. Yet

¹ April 1896, No. 83, pp. 38 *sqq.*

² *The Bull 'Ap. Cur.'* &c. p. 42.

³ Letter Ap. § 8, p. 19.

⁴ *Lectures and other Theological Papers*, p. 217.

⁵ *On the Lord's Supper* (Parker Society), p. 369; cf. p. 361.

⁶ Dixon, iii. 264.

'if our
in the
selves,
rience,
associat
English
respect
a suspic

and ca
service

Bu
histori
looked
House
absent
in its fa
friends

The m
Tunsta
Edw. V
rite to
realm l
by the
Council

know
the aut
is an un
mind b

express
in ques
the Oro
into us

was bu
Church
the Eng

it. Ou
minister
scientio

even he
Learnin
dine Or

of Harle

¹ Swe

² For

Book of C

³ Dix

'if our Reformers are to be blamed for having refrained from using in the revised services . . . words which, however true in themselves, had been subjected to gross abuse within their own experience, and could not at the time be reclaimed from such mischievous associations, it is to the domination of the Latin Church that English Churchmen owe any loss they may have sustained in this respect. But a loss incurred in the interests of truth does not justify a suspicion of heresy,'¹

and cannot be seriously said to have corrupted or vitiated the service which it affects.

But, lastly, suppose it can. The Bull then has to face historical difficulties which its authors have entirely overlooked. The Bill for a new Ordinal was finally voted in the House of Lords on January 25, 1550. Thirteen bishops were absent from the division. Of the fourteen present, nine voted in its favour, including, besides Cranmer and five others of his friends, Wharton, Skyp, and Sampson of the Old Learning. The minority consisted of five more of the Old Learning—Tunstal, Heath, Day, Thirlby, and Aldrich. The Act (3 & 4 Edw. VI. c. 12) was short, and authorised by anticipation a rite to be devised 'by six prelates and six other men of the realm learned in God's law.' On February 2 they were appointed by the Council, but no record of their names appears in the Council Book. With the exception of Cranmer, we do not know who they were.² To say then that 'the animus of the authors of the Ordinal' was 'against the Catholic Church' is an unwarrantable assumption; for we have no hint of their mind but in the rite itself. This indeed, with its preface, expresses their intention satisfactorily enough, but is not now in question. The real point, however, is not by whom was the Ordinal formed, but by whom was it adopted and brought into use? Suppose, for the sake of argument, that Cranmer was busy with a plot to undermine the faith of the English Church in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, it is inconceivable that the English episcopate could have joined him or acquiesced in it. Out of the twenty-one bishops who were then administering their dioceses, only one, the 'learned and conscientious'³ Heath, refused to subscribe to the Ordinal, and even he was willing to obey it. Aldrich, one of the Old Learning, even consented to officiate under the second Edwardine Ordinal, with Cranmer and Ridley, at the consecration of Harley, March 26, 1553.⁴ Of Edward's bishops, moreover,

¹ Swete, *On the Bull*, &c., pp. 20, 22.

² For these details, cf. Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 259 *sqq.*

³ Dixon, iii. 196.

⁴ Stubbs, *Registr. Sacr.* p. 81.

there were nine who continued to hold their sees under Mary, and assented to the changes of her *régime*. They were Thirlby, Sampson, Kitchin, Goodrich, King, Chambers, Wharton, Salcot, and Aldrich. We have no right to libel these men as time-servers. Most of them were stout for the old ideas. Is it conceivable, then, that they would have accepted Cranmer's revised Ordinal if it had involved them in a conspiracy to deny the doctrine of the Priesthood and the Sacrifice? They found their guarantees, as we have a right to find them, in the broad and balanced phraseology adopted to include every function of the priestly office, as also in the solemn declaration of the preface that, so far from there being any animus against the Catholic Church, it was intended to continue the same Orders in this Church of England as she had received and handed on from the beginning.

One word more. When the Pope argues defect of intention from the adoption of 'a rite not approved by the Church,'¹ the whole 'force of this argument depends upon the meaning which is given to "The Church."' ² Quite so. But that opens up wider differences which, till Rome is other than she is, no discussion, but only submission, can resolve.

ART. V.—LIFE AND LETTERS OF ARCHBISHOP MAGEE.

The Life and Correspondence of William Connor Magee, Archbishop of York, Bishop of Peterborough. By JOHN COTTER MACDONNELL, D.D., Canon Residentiary of Peterborough, sometime Dean of Cashel. 2 vols. (London, 1896.)

THIS is the second archiepiscopal biography which has come before us within a year. But the two works have nothing in common, except perhaps their indiscretions. The *Life of Manning* was bulky and heavy, and, far from leaving its subject to tell his own tale, it related a great number of things which he would scarcely have wished to be told. The *Life of Archbishop Magee* is brief, as biographies go in these days. It reads as easily and brightly as one of his own speeches, and the biographer is so far from intruding himself that he does not give us enough of assistance, the letters already in many cases requiring a Croker to annotate them, as much as Boswell's *Johnson* did forty years after its appearance.

¹ Letter Ap. § 9, p. 21.

² Swete, *On the Bull*, &c., p. 23.

Ca-
tion of
terms,
brought
unequal
member
theolog
literary
was no
should
donnell
of the
wishing
compet
in this
have as
been re
half a d
which f
life to r
anomal

The
was ma
himself
such as
It is a
shortco
miss in
find in
though
Maurice
the qual

But
seems r
addition
bishop M
cerning
inquirers
of spirit
so absor
too dista
of his r
stood ab
one phas
the sam

VOL. 2

Canon Macdonnell is no Boswell, except in loyal admiration of the subject of his work. He was a friend on equal terms, and, as Magee would have been the first to admit, he brought into the partnership a stock of intellect not at all unequal in its way to that of its more brilliant and successful member. His Donnellan Lectures on the Atonement are a theological performance much more important than any literary work which his friend, who said of himself that he was no writer, left behind. When we say, therefore, that we should have willingly accepted a larger amount of Dr. Macdonnell's biographical narrative even at the sacrifice of some of the earlier portion of the Archbishop's letters, we are wishing for nothing which he would not have been perfectly competent to give us. Our first criticism, then, is that in this *Life and Correspondence* the *Life* element should have assumed larger proportions. We should not then have been referred for an account of the bishop's episcopal work to half a dozen numbers of the diocesan magazine, a publication which few of us will ever see. Such an omission in a bishop's life to make way for parliamentary records is surely a great anomaly.

The correspondence itself is almost wholly that which was maintained from boyhood to age with Dr. Macdonnell himself; an affecting and attractive record of a friendship such as none but the true and good are capable of forming. It is a continued unveiling of the man: in his defects and shortcomings as well as in his abilities and excellences. We miss in it depth of spiritual thought, feeling, or inquiry; we find in it unfailing intellectual life and very sincere religion, though not of the rarest or loftiest type. He was not a Maurice or a Pusey, nor would he have coveted in the least the qualities of either the one or the other.

But interesting as the letters to Dr. Macdonnell are, it seems rather too much to give them to us with so little addition from other sources as 'the correspondence of Archbishop Magee.' Were there so few letters to his clergy concerning the spiritual affairs of their parishes, so few letters to inquirers upon the nature and the reasons of the faith, so few of spiritual counsel to the devout? Did the one friendship so absorb him that his communications with others were of too distant a character to make additions to our knowledge of his real self? If the Macdonnell correspondence had stood absolutely alone we should have perused it as showing one phase of the writer's mind, but we should have thought at the same time that there were other phases which other

letters might have shown us. But when in addition to the rich treasures that come from the canon's receptacles, an occasional letter to or from some other correspondent is added, we are inevitably driven to the feeling that there was not very much intimacy or private influence exercised upon other friends beside the one.

Considering these matters, and noticing the large gaps which deprive these volumes of the claim to continuity and biographical completeness, we have sometimes thought that, as we were not to have a complete *Life*, the precedent of publishing letters by themselves, such as those which in the cases of Newman, Thirlwall, and Mozley have served instead of biographies, might have been followed here. However, we shall urge no complaint; the work as we have it is so good that we are well content to take it as it is.

The future Archbishop was born in 1821 in the library of the cathedral at Cork: a dismal birthplace for so brilliant a man. The windows looked out upon the churchyard of St. Fin Barr, called by Corcagians St. Barry, and upon the ugly cathedral which has now made room for Burges's beautiful work. Within, so much space was occupied by the old books mouldering unread upon their shelves that the accommodation which remained for a family must have been very small. In after-days a soured bachelor occupied the house, and was called 'the exceeding fierce man who had his dwelling among the tombs.'

The testimonies of relations bear out the impression about Magee's childhood which Dr. Macdonnell's witnesses record. He was a very uneasy and mischievous child, and as a youth devoted to reading, and absent in company. The old people in the place in Donegal where he lived in childhood and which he revisited in the last year of his life have a tradition that his mother used to come and teach a Sunday class in the school-house, bringing with her a good piece of cord to tie her little son outside, lest he should stray. His uncle by marriage, Mr. Tredennick, once brought Willie to church to hear his father preach. The Rev. John Magee was, albeit a Calvinist, an excellent preacher, and the uncle on the way back remonstrated with the boy for being so uneasy in church. Willie replied that the body must be exercised along with the mind, and on examination he turned out to be better acquainted with the sermon than his uncle. He retained similar habits half a century later, when he complains of

'the dismal repetition of the stalest evangelicalism from an old Rip

Van V
locum
years
the ru
all me
clever
them
listeni
quaver
were o

W
sends
fully
been o
was a
dispos
down
made
really
not wh

Ho
that ti
intellec
quotat
draw m
that in
and th
quaint
criticisi
corresp

Cor
forman
early d
instanc
home f
once, fo
four o'
gentlem
leaving

Mag
self; in
vainest
young n
their eld
and Sch

Van Winkle kind of a curate whom Thomson has picked up as his *locum tenens* here. Listening to it took me back some forty-five years of life to the time when such "preaching of the Gospel" was the rule; yet it did not seem dreary then. Because, I suppose, as all men nearly held those doctrines then, a considerable number of clever men preached them and put life into them. But to hear them now—from a dull, elderly, pompous old man—seems like listening to a spinet played by an elderly lady and sung to with quaverings that make you sad to think how she and her instrument were once young and voted charming' (ii. 207).

We are scandalised by the tales which a schoolfellow sends to Dr. Macdonnell of Magee's maltreatment of beautifully bound books. Perhaps the beautiful binding may have been only cloth, but even so, to tear them from their covers was a cruelty which agreed too well with the mischievous disposition ascribed to him by others. It was well kept down in after-life. But still we can remember that when he made a point against an opponent his face used to assume a really vicious expression that showed the spirit of mischief not wholly extinct.

However he treated the outsides of books, his delight at that time was to devour their contents. The nature of his intellectual work in after-life was not such as to involve much quotation of books, and certainly no speaker could seem to draw more directly from his own resources. Yet it is certain that in youth he read much and with concentrated attention, and the letters of the last period of his life show an acquaintance with the literature of the day, and an acuteness in criticising it which, as it chances, do not often appear in the correspondence of his middle age.

Concentration on his books was, according to an informant of ours who was brought very close to him in early days, the source of his absence of mind, of which many instances are given. On one occasion he brought his sisters home from a ball, and, arriving at home, fled upstairs at once, forgetting to pay the driver, who remained outside till four o'clock in the morning, when he rang to ask whether the gentleman whom he had driven to the house would soon be leaving the very late party which he supposed to be going on.

Magee as a young man had an excellent opinion of himself; in fact, a lady who knew him well says that he was the vainest young man she ever saw. But the vanity of clever young men is to our minds far more excusable than that of their elders, and serves, as Hugh Miller remarks in *My Schools and Schoolmasters*, to persuade them of their fitness for the

contests of life, and brace them up to contend when no actual successes have as yet occurred to encourage them. We learn accidentally from an address by a Dublin physician given in the *Life* (i. 269) that Magee made trial for six months of the career of medicine. His pursuits and tendencies, however, as well as his family connexions, pointed to orders as his destination. But between the period of his university studies and the age for ordination, a period intervened during which, by the testimony of his contemporaries, he led, to say the least, an idle life, which left him much to regret in after-years. He won a share of university honours, and some in the Divinity school, but creditable as this would have been to an ordinary student, they were not what diligence would have secured to a man of his intellectual powers, to which was added a most unusual memory. His distinctive university reputation was gained as an orator in the famous Historical Society. Dr. Macdonnell gives us a specimen of the address with which Magee opened the session in which that society, after a long ostracism from the walls of Trinity College, was admitted to the official recognition which it still enjoys. The passage concerns the future work of the student of divinity, and reaches no doubt a higher pitch of eloquence than most men, not to say most youths, attain. But it does not ring very real to our ear, and displays to our thinking not much feeling, and none of that intense intellectual earnestness with which the efforts of after-years were instinct.

His first curacy was that of St. Thomas's parish in Dublin. There he laboured hard to perfect his preaching power. We have been told by one who ought to know that at first he wrote his sermons, and learned them by heart. Dr. Macdonnell gives the somewhat different account that he wrote them as an assistance to thinking them out, but was not accustomed to look at the manuscript again, though its very words were generally repeated, while the arrangement might be varied. Certain it is, however, that he wrote carefully and laboured much on the plan of the sermons; and afforded the useful example to young clergymen of a man who refused to be beguiled by the possession of extraordinary powers of speaking into resting satisfied with what he could do without trouble, but framed the ideal of a sermon which approved itself to his own judgment, and then took unstinted trouble to attain it. He explains his plan in a letter written two years after his ordination.

the m
so as
will
was n
every
I don
A go
Eloq
sine q

I
when
'Iris
istic.
Celti
also i
Ever
parag
tendi
on a
cours

T
conce
We
St. T
he w
that i
were
to th
parish
and a
posed
testar
eloqu
in Dr
was n
arise.
called
The c
array
lent a
When
real w
he tau
place.

'The great aim of the preacher who wants to excel is to *master* the mind of his hearers : to do this he must first master his subject so as to be able to present it in a new light. He who can do this will always command attention. Another rule I always followed was never to have more than one idea in my sermon, and arrange every sentence with a view to that. This is extremely difficult. I don't remember succeeding in doing this more than three times. A good sermon should be like a wedge, all tending to a point. Eloquence and manner are the hammer that sends it home ; but the *sine qua non* is the disposition of the parts—the shape' (i. 32).

It will thus be seen how greatly Magee was misjudged when he was regarded merely as a wonderful specimen of 'Irish eloquence,' whose volubility was his chief characteristic. In fact, he wanted some of the high characteristics of Celtic eloquence, notably spiritual feeling. But he wanted also its defects, if wordiness and exaggeration be among them. Every sentence was full of reason, and the sentences, the paragraphs, the divisions, were cumulative, all gradually tending to the one end, building, supporting, and buttressing on all sides the one idea which was the subject of the discourse.

The parishioners of St. Thomas's had, we believe, very little conception of the treasure they possessed in their curate. We remember being told by Dr. Stanford, then rector of St. Thomas's, and connected with it in Magee's time, that when he was a curate there nobody thought much about him. And that is possible. At that period all eloquence and all religion were supposed by serious persons in Dublin to be restricted to the proprietary churches, where the pews were let. The parish churches were supposed to be the abode of dullness ; and as is usual, those churches became what they were supposed to be. It would be inconceivable to a Dublin Protestant of that time that the curate of a parish was more eloquent by far than the minister of any non-parochial church in Dublin. And among the parish churches St. Thomas's was not that in which such a prodigy would seem likely to arise. The Archbishop's uncle and rector was generally called Tommy Magee—a title which bespeaks little respect. The church was sadly empty, except when the Orangemen, arrayed in their scarves, assembled on some anniversary, and lent an appearance of brightness and ritualism to the place. When Dr. Macdonnell states that his friend learnt there 'the real work of a laborious parish,' our impression is that (unless he taught himself) such learning was not to be found in the place. And when Magee himself describes the work of a

Dublin curacy as 'awful,' we believe that he is applying the standard of a less exacting age than ours; that it was 'very thankless' we can well conceive.'

But Magee's experiences of a Dublin parish were not very long. Two years after his ordination he was ordered for his health to Spain, where he spent the year 1847, a period of woe for his own country, for it was that of the Irish famine. He thought the Spanish churches tawdry, though the absence of pews was a great improvement. And it is interesting to read the opinion expressed even at that early period of his career upon the prospects of reformation in Spain (i. 29).

'With all this I believe Spain to be ripe for a reformation. Politics have not been mixed up with their religion here, making their adhesion a matter of bitter party spirit as at home, and I should not be surprised if the increasing intercourse with England, and the spread of learning, should lead to reformation in the Spanish Church, the only kind of reformation that is lasting or valuable.'

The opinion which forty years later he expressed as to the consecration of Señor Cabrera was therefore no new one.

'I have an interesting correspondence with Graves and Plunket about the consecration of Cabrera. The latter (Plunket, not Cabrera) has taken the bit in his teeth and will go forward spite of all remonstrance—he will hurt the Irish Church and not help the new Spanish one—*me judice*' (ii. 260).

Magee's married life dated from shortly after his return from Spain, and rendered him every joy and assistance that a helpmeet can provide for a busy man or that a man of hearty affections can provide for himself. In friendship and family affection Magee displays his best side. We find him deficient in general charity, too ready in exercising his talent for sarcasm, and not very well disposed to be merciful towards those who do not take his line. But a select few, his wife and children and college friends, he took to his heart and made part of himself. And though he was by no means indifferent to worldly success, it would not seem that the prizes which in that direction he secured ever gave him so much satisfaction as his fireside and the company of his old friends. 'I count my friends jealously,' said he, 'for I make no new ones.'

This intense affection in a limited circle seems to have had, at all events, a good effect upon his own spirit. The sore wounds which his fatherly heart received when two children were carried off from him in quick succession drew from him deeper expressions of personal religion than any

which
by D
life, w
becam
befor

A
was a
Edwa
he me
friend

'V
stores
comm
in all
with E
of the
thing
think

M
of a l
have
man v
and c
the in
grace

TI
repell
would
that p
into th
Churc
him w
clearly
at one
togeth
tracts.
that th
in Eng
long-f
was go
should
busine
ing th
selves
cannot

which meet us in his previous life. And the letters preserved by Dr. Macdonnell tend to show that in his early married life, which was also the period of his ministry in Bath, religion became to him a far more real thing than ever it had been before.

An exception to his habit of forming no new friendships was afforded by his intimacy with an English clergyman, Edward Duncan Rhodes, vicar of Bathampton. Magee, when he met him, was yet young, and his appreciation of his elder friend was enthusiastic.

'What a great capacious mind was his, and so filled with golden stores of thought and reading; what a manliness, what broad common sense, what a hearty love of all that was good and honest in all men . . . what do I not owe him? I regard my acquaintance with Rhodes as an era in my mental history. He first lifted me out of the narrow groove of party thought and life, and gave me something of his own broad catholic spirit. He first taught me how to think; before I met him I only knew how to argue' (i. 144).

Mr. Rhodes appears to have been an excellent specimen of a Broad Churchman. It is a pity that Magee should not have also met some equally good specimen of a High Churchman who might have shown him the same breadth of spirit and catholicity of mind united with more of positive value for the institutions of the Church and the principles of sacramental grace than he ever possessed.

The narrow party in which he had been brought up repelled him. He complained in his later days that people would regard him as an Evangelical, while at the same time that party were ever driving him by their unreasonableness into the arms of their opponents. But he never was a High Churchman, and people were hardly to be blamed for classing him with the Evangelical party when he separated himself so clearly from the party which opposed it. He was very full at one time of a project that he and Dr. Macdonnell should together bring out a series of 'Evangelical Broad Church' tracts. We do not think there is any great reason to regret that the project came to nothing. What the time demanded in England, and still more in Ireland, was a restoration of the long-forgotten faith and practice of primitive Catholicity. It was good that those who saw this need and raised the standard should be broad thinkers and full of gospel faith; but their business was to use these principles in moderating and guiding the warfare of the Catholic army, not in keeping themselves aloof from it. The Christian public of the Church cannot make nice distinctions, and the moderate men, who

refuse to join any party, have no influence on either of the contending sides, and often display a good deal of party spirit on behalf of their own middle view. And this is especially the case in Ireland, where very small causes rouse suspicion, and a man who will not positively adopt the popular creed can only avoid the accusation of Romanizing by teaching positively and with emphasis that he is not a High Churchman. Even thus, he will hardly be believed.

After nine years' success at Bath, during which he acquired the reputation of a first-rate speaker, Magee was appointed minister of Quebec Chapel, London ; but his stay there was so short as to be only a flying visit, and he returned to Ireland as rector of Enniskillen upon the presentation of Trinity College. The Board of that institution included staunch friends of the brilliant Irishman, who watched his growing fame with pride. And there can be little doubt that they invited him to return to his native land with a view to opening to him a career of promotion in the Irish Church. It would scarcely present itself to them as a possibility that the highest positions in the English Church were to be thought of for an Irishman. But for a man of abilities so popular, and at the same time so solid, everything was possible in Ireland.

Magee's greatest admirers cannot deny that if others thought him worthy of promotion he was himself very willing to be promoted. He makes no secret of it, least of all when a prize has been given away, and he protests that, however others may have been looking out for it, he had not. When we admit this, we admit that he was not of the very highest stamp of Christian priest. He was not of those who would not lift a finger for preferment, and to whom the opportunities of any office are infinitely more important than its honour or its prominence. But, taking him as he was, we can very well explain and very well excuse his desire to rise, without imputing to him any sordid ambition. For not only was he a poor man with a considerable family, he was also fitted for the higher offices of the Church as few men are. He was, as he himself says, more a preacher than a pastor. With his unrivalled power of speech he might well hope to do more work and more good as a dignitary than as a parish priest. Let those of us cast a stone at him who have the reason which he had to suspect ourselves of a capacity for filling higher stations than those we possess.

His first Irish preferment was a post as likely as any in Ireland to bring him into collision with the most cherished

local
very
A gr
corru
wars
were
strug
banne
march
from
picion
And
are st
calism
shout
F
groun
weap
more
sarcas
his re
irresis
the C
if the
in the
preach
too m
possib
the b
him a
defeat
And
have
been
all th
have
catech
the C
It is
the E
is eno
passa
and t
presen
the o

local prejudices both of laity and clergy. Enniskillen was a very Mecca of Orangemen: Derry itself was scarcely so Orange. A great deal of that miserable spirit of contention which corrupts the religions of Ireland is due to the memory of the wars of religion in the seventeenth century, intensified as they were both in the waging and in the remembrance by the struggle for the land. The drumming after the Orange banners on the twelfth of July is the memorial of ancient marches and battle-fields, and renews the ancient hatreds from year to year. The very cross itself is an object of suspicion, because it was the standard of the armies of Rome. And the places which were the scenes of battle in old times are still the places where, under a very thin veil of Evangelicalism, the ghosts of old warfare haunt and try to rouse the shouts of fight and victory whose echoes still linger around.

Fermanagh is one of the most conspicuous of these battle-grounds. And Magee, with his quick temper and ready weapon of speech, found there a spirit to contend with far more stubborn and impervious either to argument or sarcasm than his hearers in that House of Lords where his real triumphs were to be won. He was supreme and irresistible in the pulpit at Enniskillen as elsewhere. But the Orangemen were not always to be found in church, and if they were, the habits of hereditary party were far stronger in their blood than the passing impressions of eloquent preaching. It used to be said at the time that Magee made too much use of his faculty of sarcastic letter-writing. This is possible, for the fewer sarcastic letters the clergyman indites the better; and the more so if his talents be such as to make him always triumphant on paper. The opponents whom he defeats in words will avenge themselves in some other way. And so it was thought by friendly judges that Magee would have been a magnificent rector of Enniskillen if he could have been produced on Sundays to preach and put in constraint all the week to prevent his writing letters. The plan would have spoiled a great deal of good work which he did as catechist and in other duties; but so far as reconciliation of the Orangemen was concerned, it might have been effective. It is true that in a letter to Dr. Macdonnell near the end of the Enniskillen period he seems to consider that his warfare is ended and his people most happily with him; but other passages lead us to think that he was not at ease in Enniskillen, and that this letter expresses, like a great many others, only a present impression subject to corrections and deductions. On the other hand, his claim in the same letter to have attained

peace with his brother clergy is perfectly exact. His controversy with them was of a different character and more important than questions of hoisting Orange flags on the church steeple.

It turned upon the education question. During the thirty years which elapsed between the introduction of the Irish system of national education and Magee's acceptance of Enniskillen, the Evangelical clergy of Ireland had stood out against that system. It was a battle creditable to their indifference to worldly advantage (for promotion by the Government or by the bishops who favoured the Government was only to be had on the condition of joining the National Board), but by no means equally creditable to their discernment of the true interests of their people. Glad would the English clergy be at present for the opportunity of securing Government assistance in their schools upon the same conditions of religious teaching which the Irish National system offers. But the clergy who were wise enough to recognise this truth had to face the accusation of time-serving, and submit to be associated with a worldly class of men not very worthy of the promotion they secured. At the time of Magee's return to Ireland the opposition to the National Board had begun to give way. Clergy once prominent in the contest, including even a Secretary of the Church Education Society, conformed very shortly afterwards and received high promotion. The tendency of things was towards the present condition, in which a man may put his school under the Board, no man forbidding him. But enough remained of the old spirit among the general body of the clergy to provide a good deal of annoyance for an advocate of National education. Magee had been an opponent of it in his early ministry. But his opinion had changed with the progress of time. It would be monstrous unfairness to impute to him any corrupt motive. The change was that which the Irish clergy as a body have since made. But he had just come from England, and might be suspected of having imbibed there principles disloyal to Evangelicalism; he was an expectant of promotion, and might be suspected of subserviency. Accordingly there was a good deal of alienation both social and ecclesiastical between the rector of Enniskillen and his brother clergy when he placed his schools under the National Board. But we venture to question whether, taking all the circumstances into account, his course required, as Dr. Macdonnell thinks, the 'characteristic courage and firmness' which he no doubt possessed.

So
were
quen
in 18
the
volum
suade
publis
public
the pr
in his
vigou
deligh
Th
to En
provi
suppo
for wh
say h
was h
able t
in En
count
called
As
Engla

'I
"doing
men, y
theolog
You an
Tory p
at least
and mig
howl in
Why sh
.....
for a bi

We
an Iris
those
as goo
was me
On
falling

Some of the lectures which Magee delivered at this period were to our thinking among the best specimens of his eloquence. We have before us the lecture on Scepticism given in 1863, and find that we can read it with more pleasure than the speeches and addresses contained in the collected volume, or even than many of the sermons. We are persuaded that a volume of the lectures of this sort which he published in separate form during his life would meet with public acceptance. They were written in full or prepared for the press by the author's hand while the subjects were fresh in his mind, and they retain much of that admirable ease and vigour which seized hold of his audiences and kept them delighted and instructed from his first word to his last.

The course of events by which Magee was brought back to England may well be thought to bear the marks of special providence. His friends transferred him to Ireland, never supposing that in England he could attain that high position for which they thought him fit. They, and perhaps we may say he himself, thought that nothing less than a bishopric was his just meed; and what premier could be supposed able to conceive the novel idea of making an Irishman bishop in England: the free exchange of bishops between the two countries having been hitherto conducted on what O'Connell called a one-sided reciprocity?

As time passed on Magee became eager to return to England.

'I confess,' he writes, 'that any presumptuous dreams I had of "doing good" in the Irish Church by raising (with a few like-minded men, yourself and others) a standard of liberality and moderation in theology or politics are dissipated by an experience of five years. You and I and the like of us are anachronisms by twenty-five years. Tory politics and "gospel" theology will sway the Irish Church for at least one generation more. I think I was of some use in England, and might be again; I am a speaker only, and cannot bring myself to howl in Ireland after the fashion approved by Irish Churchmen. . . . Why should I not go back there while I have any work left in me? . . . Do not think I am writing in any silly huff at being roqué'd for a bishopric!'

We well remember hearing his answer to the question what an Irishman's chances in England were as compared with those of an Englishman. He replied that they were just as good until he made a false step, and that the Englishman was more readily forgiven.

On two occasions an Irish bishopric was on the point of falling to his lot.

One was that on which Lord Carlisle sought to remove Bishop Fitzgerald from Killaloe to Dublin and Magee to Killaloe. The good-natured viceroy was much disappointed when Dr. Trench was brought over to Dublin. This failure brought no chagrin to Magee, who knew nothing about the intention to promote him until twenty years after. Not so the second case, in which the aged Bishop of Meath failed to die before the Liberal ministry went out of office in 1866. Magee would have had the appointment, but saw a Conservative succeed to it. However, we all know the witty and amusing fashion in which Mr. Disraeli, that master of surprises, transferred him to Peterborough. It is difficult to avoid speculating upon the consequences to the Church and to himself which might have resulted from Magee's remaining in Ireland. He could have done nothing more to hinder disestablishment than he did; perhaps not so much. He might have been able, when disestablishment came, to persuade the Irish bench to make terms with Mr. Gladstone; for that was the course which at first approved itself to his reason. Had he done so, they would, we believe, have procured no better conditions than resistance gave them in the end, and they would have earned for themselves, however unjustly, the standing reproach of 'selling the pass.' The position of Bishop Magee brought him to a certain degree into communication with the Liberal leaders, and an interview with Mr. Gladstone proved to him how little could be hoped from compromise, and enabled him with a perfectly free mind to deliver the wonderful speech against the Bill which Dr. Macdonnell describes so vividly. We are able to corroborate his account from personal remembrance: the magnificence of the scene, the House crowded not merely with Lords, but with Commons, the enthusiasm of the peers, usually so apathetic. In a few days the glamour was gone and the Lords had passed the second reading; and it was better for the Irish Church that they did so. We remember asking the Bishop a day or two after whether he agreed with what had been said by his predecessor Bishop Jeune, that if he lived for ten years more he would be the last established Bishop of Peterborough, and he replied that he did. Therein he was mistaken; twenty-eight years have passed, and English disestablishment looks further away than it did then.

If the brilliant man had lived his episcopal life in Ireland he would have had a less conspicuous scene for his oratory, but not less important subjects on which to debate; for in the Irish synodical discussions on the revision of the Prayer

Book
of h
mun
emin
that
very
ceder
than
the e
the a
him
ment
gelic
requi
to ac
—the
regar
many
plaus
able
thro
his E
of th
was v
trust
stand
beate
ing p
He v
powe
than
nents
Act t
prom
donn
Comm
oppos
and l
he w
but co

'v
revisi
rubric
compl
this w

Book he would have helped in framing the forms of devotion of his Church and fixing her position in the Anglican communion. To be sure, he would have held his usual pre-eminence as the champion orator of the assembly. The fact that his only rival, the present Primate of Ireland, never took a very influential part in the debates would have been no precedent for him, since his powers were better fitted for debates than those of the Archbishop. But he had not, so far as the evidence of his biography goes, the fixity of opinion or the amount of theological knowledge which would have made him a safe leader in an assembly where his eloquence and mental vigour would have made him sure to lead. Evangelical Broad Churchmen were not the class of persons required there, but rather sturdy High Churchmen not afraid to act as a party and oppose revision positively and obstinately—the sort of persons whom Bishop Magee would have regarded with a good deal of contempt and made the butt of many a sarcasm. But we feel by no means sure that some plausible mistake commending itself for the time being to able men of affairs might not have captivated him, and through him the synod. It is true that on first hearing in his English home of the proposal to revise the Prayer Book of the Irish Church, he took the view of the project which was worthy of his clear vision, and wrote to his friend: ‘I do trust that you, and others who act with you, will take your stand upon the Prayer Book as it is. Even if you are beaten—as I fear you will be—your restraining and moderating power will be greater than if you join the revisionists.’ He was perfectly right. The restraining and moderating power which hindered revision from going to greater lengths than it did was not that of the moderates but of the opponents of revision: just as in the passing of the Irish Church Act the moderating power had been exercised, not by compromise, but by opposition. However, when Dean Macdonnell himself, with the best intentions, joined the Revision Committee, his friend abated the principle of general opposition to revision for which he had previously declared, and laid down the rule which, if he had to deal with revision, he would pursue: namely, to stand firm on doctrinal matters, but concede everything in forms and externals.

‘Were I on the committee I should go in for such rubrical revision as should make Ritualism all but impossible. A vestments rubric would go a long way to this, and a canon or two would complete it. This done, I would take my stand on the ground that this was sufficient remedy, and that doctrinal revision was not and

could not be any additional guarantee. . . . In order to this I would not hesitate to deal trenchantly even with rubrics and ceremonies, on the ground that they are mutable, even for expediency's sake, and then take my stand on doctrine as immutable.'

These sentences describe with general accuracy the course which the Irish bishops actually took, and considering their difficult position they ought not to be harshly judged. But while doctrine did not remain absolutely unscathed, the trenchant dealing with rubrics and ceremonies which the Bishop would have sanctioned did immense harm. The eastward position, which he found nearly legalised in England when he received his bishopric, and which he himself never attempted to hinder in his diocese (ii. 22, 64, 69), was prohibited in Ireland, and many other points of practice which in England have gained a similar position, are in like manner under a ban in the sister Church, which has thus established for herself an isolation of which no reasonable account can be given, and which is exceedingly injurious to her reputation. Few will now maintain that the Irish bishops might not have done something more than they did to hinder ceremonial restrictions; it seems that if Bishop Magee had been their adviser he would have prompted them to deal trenchantly with all such matters in order to save the doctrine. The concessions had no such tendency, and the advice would have been erroneous both in general and in particular.

The Bishop's objection, if such it can be called, to the proposal to permit deacons to pronounce the absolution at Matins and Evensong, is that some extreme ritualists, desirous of degrading public absolutions, desired the same change. But surely the true reply is that, be the form itself what it may, the use of it by the priest is rested in terms on the fact that God has given power and commandment to his ministers to declare and pronounce absolution. And to open its use to deacons would be to declare that they are of the class of God's ministers of whom this can be said; which admission would be a serious doctrinal change and irreconcilable with the Ordinal. Again, the Bishop is wrong in supposing that the indicative absolution in the Visitation of the Sick is mediæval and Western only. The fact is that the Reformers were strongly attached to it on the reasonable ground that when our Lord says, 'Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted,' the form of expression which best carries out His suggestion is 'I remit' or 'I absolve.'

The correspondence about the Irish Church ceased with wonderful completeness when both friends had left their

nati
resp
share
tabli
acute
popu
Engl
in of
influ
Chur
much
whic
excu
hard
it is
opini
is to
her.

C
a less
expe
thing
have
Cano
tive
shoul
ally i
reviv
He w
ready
heare
Chur
the n
'the m
Lidd
stop t
to a
prese
to pr
woul
W
meth
Dr. M
Altho
which

native land. Dr. Macdonnell received, in spite of the general respect and regard felt for him in Ireland, a considerable share of the rubs and flouts which were common in the disestablished Church, and which moderate men felt perhaps more acutely than those who were declared opponents of the popular party. His friend, who had reached harbour in England, resented these probably more than he himself, and in offering him an English living said, 'I trust you will not be influenced by any overstrained idea of duty to the Irish Church. You owe it, in my opinion, nothing. It owes you much.' That is one of the passages in the Bishop's letters which we wish his biographer had omitted. It may be well excused in an affectionate friend hasty in his utterances, yet hardly in a bishop giving counsel on a moral question. But it is not pleasant twenty-five years after the event to find the opinion published that one's duty to one's spiritual mother is to be measured by the treatment one has received from her.

Of the Archbishop's career as an English bishop we have a less continuous view in the letters than we had of his Irish experiences. The two friends were close at hand, and many things were treated in personal conversation which would have been recorded in letters had they been separated. Canon Macdonnell is obliged to be more liberal in the narrative which occupies the intervals between the letters; we should have desired from him a greater liberality still, especially in regard to the Bishop's relation to the great Church revival, which was in progress all the time of his episcopate. He was not the man to offer it a fanatical opposition. His ready wit and the orator's instinctive sympathy with earnest hearers fitted him to take friendly part in assemblies of High Churchmen. Yet we do not believe that he ever understood the movement or discerned its power. He could speak of 'the merely feminine minds of such monks in petticoats as Liddon.' Upon this highly unworthy utterance we must stop to say that we do not think the hasty thoughts written to a friend as carelessly as they would be spoken if he were present, become, morally speaking, the property of that friend to promulgate after death, any more than the hasty words would be during life.

We can find little of that large-minded and courageous method of treating a difficult subject which is claimed for Dr. Magee, in his dealings with the subject of Confession. Although he does not express the fanatical horror of the word which makes some people object much more strongly to the

confession of our sins than to the commission of them, yet we cannot admit that he faced either the facts of human nature or of Church history which bear on the question.

We do not see how any one can reasonably maintain that the Prayer Book, while prescribing confession in the two cases of troubled consciences unable to find peace, and of the sick, can be justly understood to discourage it in the case of any who may choose to make use of it, or to hinder the clergy from advising it if they see good, always provided that they do not enforce it as a necessity for salvation. The first Prayer Book of Edward VI. forbids those who practise it to judge those who do not, and *vice versa*. And though this passage was withdrawn in 1552, a distinct general approval of the first book and its contents was at the same time made in the Act of Uniformity prefixed to the second. It cannot be that so momentous a change as the general disapproval of private confession would imply was made in this silent fashion. The only change that can justly be supposed is the transference of the whole matter of private confession and absolution to the choice and responsibility of priests and people, the Church prescribing nothing except the sufficiency of public confession and absolution for those whose consciences are therewith content. To speak, therefore, of the 'rules of our Church in this matter' (ii. 78) is to suppose the existence of rules where they never existed, and to fetter the priest and his penitent where the Church meant to leave them free.

And this led in practice to very unwholesome advice. What priest could deal faithfully with consciences when his bishop directs him to say to them (ii. 78), 'Tell me those sins, and only those, which still weigh upon your mind'? Who could 'firmly but kindly check all attempts at what is called a full confession'? And when the confession is made, what priest that remembers the rubric which in the book of 1549 directed the absolution in the Visitation of the Sick to be used in all private confessions, and that this rubric with the rest of the book it belongs to has still the approval of the Church, could content himself with saying, 'I fully believe that you are forgiven by God, and I, as His minister, assure you of this. You may now go, so far as I can judge, with a clear conscience to the Holy Communion, and there you will receive the benefit of absolution'? This is not what the Lord's commission to the priest suggests, nor what St. Paul used to the repentant Corinthian whom he bids the Church 'forgive,' and whom he himself 'forgives'; nor is it what the exhortation in the Communion Office contemplates when it bids penitents

expect
of ad
fession
mission
confes
virtue
you.'
dioces
been
recov
worse

It
consid
to Co
by the
that
part i

'W
majori
the la
Colom
had no
up, as
definit
of ord
as reg
as you

There
ever
been,
the ti
can d

A
throug
which
to us
Erasti
Magee
in pra
things
While
there
see th

'T
Archbi
VOL

expect, not a reference to their next Communion, but the benefit of absolution with ghostly counsel at the time of their confession. And we know not what the priest's office and commission mean, if he is to instruct one who has just made confession to him that 'there is no special or exceptional virtue in priest's absolution, even were I authorised to give it you.' Truly, if Bishop Magee's presbyter followed his diocesan's prescription, we can well conceive the result to have been that the patient would not 'adopt his treatment and so recover, but have resort to some other physician and so grow worse.'

It would seem from the *Life* that Bishop Magee had a considerable share in the Report on Confession presented to Convocation in 1873 (i. 290).¹ This was adopted generally by the Lambeth Conference of 1878. But we cannot think that the complacency with which the Bishop regarded his part in that Conference was justifiable.

'When these matters were struck out, I saw that the great majority would go with the Archbishop, and that if I protested, at the last I should find myself in the same boat with Bombay, Colombo, and one or two others "of that ilk," a position in which I had no wish to appear, and so I yielded, and in yielding shut them up, as I had been their πρόμαχος. We have now got a clever and definite and brief condemnation of the Ritualists, which as a point of order was most irregularly introduced and which is *pessimi exempli* as regards future conferences; but which for the present distress is, as you say, most weighty and valuable' (ii. 96).

There spoke the parliament-man, not the bishop; and whatever his judgment of his action and its result may have been, we think that the summing-up of a colonial bishop at the time was the truer one: 'The Archbishop of Canterbury can do anything he likes.'

And the same account may be given of the passage through the Lords of the P. W. R. Act, and the support which it received from the Bishop. The fact is, as it seems to us, that though well able to detect and condemn the Erastianism of Archbishop Tait, the power which Bishop Magee's eloquence gave him in legislative assemblies led him in practice to an inclination for dealing by actual law with things which had better have been left to spiritual influence. While preferring to see England free to seeing her sober, there is room to doubt whether he would have preferred to see the clergy free to seeing them Ritualists. The support

¹ The Bishop's share in the Report is not mentioned in the *Life of Archbishop Tait*, vol. ii. p. 169.

which he gave to the P. W. R. Act is described by himself in 1876 as having been yielded 'deliberately though reluctantly, from a conviction which he still entertained that the dangers of unrestrained licence were greater than even the obviously great dangers of some measure of restraint' (ii. 53). Eleven years later his good sense and experience had led him as it led Archbishop Tait to softer views, and he gives a reason for his adhesion to the Act of which we must say no sign appears at the time of its enactment:

'The first duty on the part of those who govern the Church towards those whom they are called to govern is to make the rules they are to obey clear and definite; and then, if needs be, to provide punishment for disobedience to these. To reverse this process is only to breed confusion and strife. For this reason I should never have voted for or supported the Public Worship Regulation Act had not its introduction been accompanied by Letters of Business to Convocation for the Revision of Rubrics—a revision which I fully hoped and believed would have been accomplished well within the limit of three years named in that Act as the term of grace for contumacious clerks' (ii. 243).

We think the Bishop must have somewhat deceived himself in 1887 as to the strength of his expectation of rubrical revision in 1876. For in 1874 he wrote:

'I now fully believe that nothing will be done in the way of revision in Convocation. I trust that may prove the safest course, if safe be the proper word for a choice between serious perils. But it is at any rate the only possible course' (ii. 14; see also p. 54).

It is not shown that Archbishop Magee ever was a Church leader in the difficulties of the time, nor can we maintain that in his sermons he discovers and displays great guiding thoughts. The sermons are most able compositions, and the student of arrangement might make them his model. But now that we can no longer hear them from that wonderful voice which seized possession of us as we listened, we note their want of the uplifting power which belongs to the highest religious eloquence. We believe that Canon Liddon was the greater preacher because of his greater spiritual intensity, and if that opinion is feminine we can only submit to be so described.

As a speaker upon the platform or in the House of Lords Magee was so great that we despair of describing his greatness by words. His greatness as a bishop belongs to that peculiar condition of the Church in which she is intermingled with the State, and her spokesmen must busy themselves in secular assemblies and hold their place and hers among the men of the world. None could hinder Magee from holding his

plac
be c
voic
was
will
And
befo
end
frien
not
judg

Phil

A w
sup
its f
hard
blish
who
nor
the r
havin
other
And
even
cond
as di
Chris
A
betw
woul
Reve
debt
prove
God
press
you
faith

place. He was outspoken and courageous, for a man may well be courageous who carries such an irresistible weapon as that voice. And the Life proves that behind the sarcasm there was an affectionate heart and genuine faith. That there will be no more such letter-writers the biographer foretells. And we shall join him in thinking that it will be long indeed before there is such another speaker. Whether the rich endowments that he possessed enable us to endorse his friend's lofty claim to place him among the Great Men we do not care to argue: for how little does our human and fallible judgment matter to him now!

ART. VI.—PHILOSOPHY OF THEISM.

Philosophy of Theism, being the Gifford Lectures delivered before the University of Edinburgh in 1894-95. First Series. By ALEXANDER CAMPBELL FRASER, LL.D., &c. (Edinburgh and London, 1895.)

A WORK on natural theology is apt to strike believers as superfluous and unsatisfactory. Already holding the truth in its fulness as taught by Holy Scripture and the Church, they hardly care to have what can only be a portion of it established on the less sure foundation of philosophy. But those who think thus are, we venture to suggest, neither charitable nor reverent. They are not charitable, because they forget the needs of those numerous and often earnest persons who, having lost their grasp of the Christian tradition, seek some other, though it be a lower, help to regain their faith in God. And they are not reverent, because reverence will value highly even the slightest traces which may be left by Him of whose condescension it is that we know and worship Him, whether as dimly disclosed in nature or as perfectly revealed in Christ.

And, after all, it is possible to overrate the contrast between Natural and Revealed Religion. Many persons would say that Natural Religion proves God by logic, and Revealed Religion bids us accept Him by faith. We owe a debt to agnostic writers who have shown that we cannot prove God by logic. But when they proceed to say that God cannot be known if He cannot be proved, we may fairly press on them the questions, 'Is there anything at all which you can prove without some assumption on the credit of faith? Must you not believe in the reality of the universe,

in the extension of matter, in the existence of causation, in the general veracity of the senses, before you can argue about physical sciences? Must you not believe in a certain unity in nature before you can conceive the idea of a science at all? And if so, if all first principles are objects not of proof but of faith, is it to be wondered at if God, the First of all, should of necessity be not demonstrable but credible?

But then the definition of Natural Religion must be amended. It is no longer to be regarded as a demonstration of God by logic, but as an exercise of faith, though in a smaller area of experience than that which is considered by Revealed Religion. In the facts of the universe, including man as its crown, is there that which enables us not to demonstrate God as we demonstrate the existence of oxygen in water, but to believe in Him? Logic has reached its limits when it has proved that this or that non-theistic system will not hold together or explain the facts of the case before us. If this could be done exhaustively, with respect to every possible non-theistic system, then there would be a sort of negative demonstration of God; but it is notoriously difficult to exhaust all possible theories. Faith takes a shorter path. She brings with her a conviction of the existence of God which belongs to the same class as the conviction of the reality of the universe, which is the foundation of science. She applies this element to the dangerous blanks which logic has discovered in the non-theistic systems, and finds it fills them. At the same time she courts the criticism of logic not as to the certainty, but as to the coherence and adequacy of her own hypothesis, and it stands the test. We could never prove God; but we (that is to say, the human race as a whole) believed in Him, and we found our faith purged but not overthrown by logical criticism, and capable of filling up precisely those gaps which made non-theistic systems unsatisfactory.

The principle of faith, then, is not peculiar to Revealed Religion. It is common to Natural Religion and science. It is mainly because Dr. Fraser recognizes this universal religious and scientific scope of faith that we are predisposed to value his work. It will be seen how we appreciate his arguments, and we put no lower value on his temper, which seems to us studiously fair and reverent. The writer speaks with manly pathos of the redoubled awfulness of his subject as he stands close to that great change which will test his convictions and disclose the secret which he considers. Perhaps we ought to have said that it *may* disclose it; for it is not

incon
yet b
has f
life a
which
as fo
which
respe
bine
furth
the u

T
glad
the C
argu
a per
have
hardl
tone
ascrib
doubt
an un
or ma
to the
more
by n
illust
theor
of its
prom
sense
Abso
an a
Abso
docu
from
And
sider

1 V
times
bygon
princip
are, th
often s
polite
Bamph

inconceivable that a man may survive his corporal death and yet be as ignorant of God as he is now. But when a Christian has for many years contemplated death as leading to a fuller life and a clearer knowledge, it is not indecision but candour which bids him consider once more, for his own sake as well as for that of his readers, the validity of that assurance for which he has been bold to spend his days. We would most respectfully express our hope that prolonged health may combine with undimmed intellect to enable Dr. Fraser to carry further, as he promises, his investigation of the testimony of the universe to God.

The courteous and temperate tone of this book is, we are glad to think, characteristic of most recent controversy on the Christian side. The habit of using ridicule instead of argument, and driving difference of opinion out of court with a peremptory censure, is one which certain Lay Sermons may have learned from Church sermons of an earlier date, but hardly from those of the present day. And to the prevalent tone of candour and courtesy on the part of Christians we ascribe in some degree what we are bold to regard as an undoubted reaction in the direction of Christianity.¹ To revile an unbeliever is to alienate those who may become his friends, or may become ours. But there are other causes which tend to the same result. As the doctrine of evolution becomes more familiar it is found (whatever truth or error be in it) by no means to exclude a personal Creator, but only to illustrate His method of creating. The purely materialistic theory of the universe, which claimed so much on the score of its wide-reaching simplicity, is found unable to fulfil its promises unless it may drop or explain away the moral sense. It is found less easy than it seemed to confess an Absolute in which the universe has its rise, and yet to give an adequate account of the universe while excluding the Absolute as unknowable. On the other hand, the Christian documents are being restored by criticism to the position from which it seemed as if criticism had deposed them. And the more the operation of the human mind is considered the more room is found for a faculty other than the

¹ We may, indeed, need to be reminded that 'controversy may sometimes become too courteous, and, in its righteous reaction against bygone intolerance, forget that toleration has its weak side also. The principle that character and conduct are the keys to creed, and that we are, therefore, more responsible for our intellectual behaviour than is often supposed, is precisely one of the points which, amid the civilities of polite debate, is apt to be insufficiently maintained' (Illingworth, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 126).

logical—a faculty which can immediately discern spiritual truth as the senses discern physical truth, and may claim for its declarations the character, not of devout sentiment or unsubstantial hope, but of real experience, worthy, when sifted and corrected by the logical faculty, of being submitted to and accepted by the Reason.

It was, then, at a hopeful time that Dr. Fraser accepted the post of Gifford lecturer. The purpose of Lord Gifford's foundation is not, indeed, the support of Christianity, but the investigation of Theism. The terms of the trust are largely quoted by the lecturer. In language which seems to us (and indeed to Dr. Fraser) pantheistic Lord Gifford would have his lecturers treat of 'the Being, Nature, and Attributes of God—that is, of the All, of the First and only Cause, the one only Substance and Being; and the true and felt Knowledge (not mere nominal Knowledge) of the relations of man and of the universe to Him' (p. 7). These terms, however pantheistic, are not taken to preclude a discussion of pantheism and a demonstration of its failure; nor do they forbid a discussion of the atheistic theory of the universe; nor, so far as Christian tradition is part of the historical experience of mankind, is the consideration of it forbidden, though it must be treated as a mere fact with which science may deal, and not invested with any assumed authority. We think, however, that Dr. Fraser has used his discretion wisely in abstaining from the consideration of the Christian documents in a work which is not historical but metaphysical. The subject is to be investigated 'as a strictly natural science . . . as astronomy or chemistry' is investigated (p. 6). Dr. Fraser, with a praiseworthy if perhaps scrupulous anxiety to be faithful to the trust, points out (p. 25) an initial difficulty, that, whereas astronomy and chemistry are sciences dealing with a specialised department of the universe, and with causes which are themselves caused, Natural Theology, if it is possible at all, must deal with the universe as a whole, and with its relation to a First Cause which is not caused. It can, then, hardly be regarded as a natural science, because it deals with that which lies beyond nature, unless the word 'nature' be stretched to include all that is—the world of causes and effects, and also the First Cause out of which they arise. If, then, the lecturer is compelled to a verbal disobedience to some of the terms of the trust, he is compelled by the very nature of the subject which he is to discuss; and in his free and unbiassed treatment of the matter he is at least as much in accordance with the founder's purpose as some Bampton

lectu
John

Is th
inter
imag
bein
noth
prob
distr
worl
let u
abili
if th
Is it
Or i
orde
Or a
and
conf
that
univ

seen
thos
post
is th
com
by
deav
the
Pan

man
whe
abou
sort
ceiv
(p. 2
com
app
of
pret
the

lecturers have been with the extract from the will of the Rev. John Bampton prefixed to their lectures.

This, then, is the problem of which these lectures treat: Is the universe a Cosmos, ordered according to Reason and interpreted by Reason? or is it a Chaos, in which order is imagined, perhaps, but absent? It is by faith in the universe being a Cosmos that we are impelled to study it at all, for nothing would be more irrational than to try to interpret a probably irrational world. Even Schopenhauer, with all his distrust of the world-process, can end the preface to his chief work thus: 'Life is short, but truth works far and lives long; let us speak the truth.'¹ Faith, then—faith in the interpretability of the universe—is the preliminary of science. But if the universe be thus rational where does its reason reside? Is it to be found in matter and the qualities inherent in it? Or is the thinker's own mind the power which reduces into order that which (if it should exist) would else be chaotic? Or are we led to see behind the changes of nature the Mind and Will of a Creator? Or, after all our search, must we confess that the assurance of our early faith has failed us, and that we do not, cannot, know where the Reason of the universe resides, nor, indeed, whether it exists at all?

If we shrink from the last unwelcome solution it would seem that the answer to the problem must be sought among those other hypotheses. Matter, self, God—besides these three postulated existences it seems vain to look for a clue. But is the clue to be sought in any one of them exclusively, or in combination of them all? Dr. Fraser answers this question by considering each of these hypotheses exclusively, endeavouring to see whether the world can be interpreted by the light of Universal Materialism, of Panegoism, or of Pantheism.

The claim of Universal Materialism commended itself to many pre-Socratic Greek philosophers. 'They were satisfied when they thought that they could answer the first question about the universe and man by resolving the whole into some sort of presentable substance—into one of the crudely conceived elements of matter—water, air, fire, as it might be' (p. 73). A similar opinion, though in a more refined form, commends itself to many minds at the present day. It appeals to the feeling of reality which belongs to the objects of sense, to its admitted success 'in provisionally interpreting many things that surround us in space' (p. 75), to the beneficent practical results to which the study of matter

¹ *The World as Will and Idea*, English transl. p. xv.

has led. Why, then, we are asked, should we look beyond the solid region of matter and sense into regions where we are likely to be the sport of illusions? Let us cast aside the beguiling vanity which makes us think of man and his 'spirit' as other than the material world around him. Man, like the rest of the universe, consists of matter—atoms aggregated into molecules, and molecules knit together sometimes to form iron, sometimes to form the vegetable or the animal, sometimes to form man. We are but a bundle of molecules which has as its property sensibility and thought, precisely as another bundle of molecules has as its property metallic hardness or crystalline brightness. Let us not conceitedly claim for ourselves to be more than an insignificant speck of matter, specially organised in the most insignificant of stars. To claim more is more foolish than for a peasant to claim a crown. The world was not made to serve us; we and the world are one thing. We are but parts of a universe consisting wholly of matter, acting according to properties inherent in it, which are called (a little inaccurately) its laws (pp. 73-89).

But, after all, are we so sure about matter as we seem to be; and, if so, on what does our certainty rest? We believe our senses, but we do not always find them veridical; and the assumption that the world around really corresponds to the mental concept of which alone we have immediate knowledge is an assumption which can never be proved. To trust our senses is to take a leap in the dark, as far as logic goes. We are far from asserting that it is an unjustifiable leap, but it is a leap of faith, and not a sober step of demonstration. Again, as Dr. Fraser reminds us (pp. 89 *sqq.*), two doctrines lie at the root of materialistic science, the indestructibility of matter and the conservation of energy; and both of these, however probable, are beyond the power of science to demonstrate. Experience teaches us that in the comparatively small part of the universe with which we are conversant, and during the brief space of time in which it has been under our ken, neither matter nor force has come into or passed out of existence; but by what means can we be assured that what is not here and now cannot be elsewhere and elsewhere? We are not disputing the doctrines in question; we are only pointing out that the transition from 'this is not' to 'this cannot be' is effected, not by logic, but by faith. Once more, how do we make the transition from a series of observed sequences to a theory of causation? If matter be all it is difficult to conceive what overcomes its

inert
moth
answ
two
in an
exclu
by sa
we fi
it can
I
which
to m
really
vanit
is thi

B
accou
from
when
to de
bund
proce
there
is dr
act o
action
logica
mater
with
very
act o
chang
true,
of ex
influe
which
the p
like.
the o
is qua
and t
possib
act of
tion,
effere

inertia and makes one aggregation of molecules the fruitful mother of another aggregation. Materialism, then, can only answer the problem even of the material universe by one of two methods—either by admitting faith (if not in God, yet in an Absolute) to a province which was marked out as the exclusive realm of sense experience interpreted by logic, or by saying that we can only take facts as we find (or think we find) them, and must leave the universe to solve itself if it can.

It seems a poor outcome of the boasts of materialism, which was to banish all but demonstration from thought and to make all things clear. Either we must readmit faith (never really banished) or we must relinquish, with other human vanities, the desire to ask not only 'Is this so?' but 'Why is this so?'

But if Universal Materialism fails to give a satisfactory account even of the material world without calling in help from the despised province of faith, its failure is still greater when it deals with problems of morality. There is no need to demonstrate over and over again that if man is a mere bundle of molecules, evolved and modified by the world process, he is a mere machine, destitute of free-will, and therefore incapable of moral responsibility. In all his acts he is driven by an inscrutable necessity, of which the 'wrong' act of one man is as inevitable an outcome as the 'right' action of another. It is worth noticing that it is not physiological science which is opposed to free-will, but the materialistic philosophy which binds together scientific bricks with the untempered mortar of a mechanical faith. It may very probably be true, though it has not been proved, that no act of man can take place without a corresponding molecular change in his brain. But it is not proved, and it need not be true, that this brain change is produced simply by the impact of external forces. A man steals a loaf. No doubt external influences have much to do with producing the brain state which accompanies the act—the sight and the desire of food, the pain of hunger, the instinct of self-preservation, and the like. But it can never be proved that these influences are the only influences which modify the brain; that their sum is quantitatively equivalent to the modification of the brain and the act which is the outcome of it. It is at least not impossible that in part the man modifies his own brain by an act of volition, as he does sometimes by an act of imagination, and that the mandate which the brain gives to the efferent nerves corresponds to the impact brought by the

afferent nerves *plus* the modification of them which is due to the free-will of the man himself. This suggestion is not maintained as a truth. What is here maintained is that without freedom of will there can be no valid meaning for morality; that there can be no moral judgment between two lines of action, one of which is inevitable; and that remorse can only mean to the mere materialist a blundering perception that a man has made an unfortunate step which he could not help making.

Moreover, as Dr. Fraser points out, intelligence goes the way of morality on the merely materialistic hypothesis. It is but another name for brain molecules in motion.

'Its verified inferences, as well as its unproved hypotheses, are all alike transitory; if we are not allowed to presuppose in the primary data more than molecules, accustomed under certain conditions to manifest self-conscious life. And thus even Materialism, this philosophic Monism, itself disappears, along with the phenomenon of self-conscious intelligence by which it was reasoned out in the abyss of universal Nescience' (p. 103).

Let us turn to the second of the ordinary postulates, the Ego, and see whether in what Dr. Fraser calls Panegoism the solution is to be found. While universal Materialism denied or disparaged the substance of mind, making man no more than a heap of molecules, and his consciousness only the transient changes in the arrangement of them, Panegoism runs to the opposite extreme, and makes Mind (and especially the mind of the thinker who has a certainty about it which he cannot have about any other mind) the only substance. The world, like the individual, is materialistic before it is egoistic. The little child has to learn by degrees that 'baby' has a right to call himself 'I'; and we do not find the conception of Ego nearly so prevalent in early Greek philosophy as that of the material universe. Dr. Fraser does not give the importance which, we think, ought to be given to Socrates's ethical questioning in awaking and forming the consciousness of the Ego. On that questioning, as nowadays on the moral sense, the materialistic bark foundered. But he is certainly right in showing (p. 108) that Christianity emphasized the 'crowning wonder' of Myself, and prepared the way for the Cartesian formula of primary certainty: *Cogito, ergo ego sum*. Then came the further thought—

'This wonderful universe, this ever-changing combination of molecules, which has its only meaning for me in my own personal perceptive consciousness—would it have any meaning, would it indeed have any real existence, if there were not an Ego to perceive

it? S
of for
a sub
unqua
denied
mind

It
the e
the p
we ca
way o
canno
unive
though
the h
power
that t
perce
'such
cult t
argum
such
is to
sense
in wh
recogn

Br
like
Fraser
For if
I have
some
may b
verse
somet
which
wrong
it mus

Th
isolate
says, i
(with
in itse
langu
Matte

it? Strip matter of the attributes with which my mind clothes it—of form, colour, quantity, even extension—and what is the ghost of a substance which remains? Nothing but “an unqualified and unquantified *something*, of which nothing can be either affirmed or denied” (p. 124). Why, then, should I look further than my own mind in order to understand the universe?’

It is true that this argument does not necessarily deny the existence of things apart from our consciousness; for the pictures may be in the gallery at midnight, though then we cannot perceive them. It really seems to be a roundabout way of stating the truism that unless we perceive things we cannot think about them. The coherence of things in the universe may be due to something incognisable, even though the formulæ of quality, sequence, causation, be only the human forms under which I conceive this unknown power. If Panegoism be carried to such a pitch as to mean that the existence of the universe is identical not with our perception but with our imagination of it—if the world be all ‘such stuff as dreams are made of’—then, indeed, it is difficult to see how the theory can be disproved, because the argument which opposes it is itself a dream argument; but such a theory is hardly consistent with sanity. The use of it is to show that the prime assumption of science, that the senses are more or less veridical, is itself an exercise of faith in what cannot be demonstrated, more often exercised than recognized.

But, however incapable of theoretic disproof, Panegoism, like pure Materialism, is practically wrecked (though Dr. Fraser hardly notices the point) on the rock of conscience. For if I am aware that I ought not to have done that which I have done I am bound to admit some law beside myself, some tribunal before which I stand. Whatever molecules may be, morals are certainly not my own reading of a universe only intelligible because I think it. There is, then, something in the universe other than what I conceived it, which bears witness against my conception as false and wrong. Unless Panegoism will find room for this Something it must fall, with pure Materialism, into the pit of Nescience.

The third of the ordinary postulates is God; and the isolated recognition of this postulate is Pantheism. God, it says, is the only Substance, the one infinite Reality. And if (with Descartes) we take substance to mean that which exists in itself (p. 145) there is no exception to be taken to this language; for Materialism and Panegoism only tell us that Matter and the Ego exist—*how* they exist is not stated;

but Pantheism at least confesses Something which exists in itself, the prime Cause which is not caused.

There is so much outward similarity between a pantheistic identification of the universe with God and a theistic belief in God immanent and operative in the universe, that we need not be surprised to find in theistic writers language which is logically pantheistic. There is even in Holy Scripture language which might be susceptible of a pantheistic interpretation did it not occur in a book which emphatically ascribes personality both to God and to man, recognizes sin, and reveals man's responsibility. We therefore welcome from Dr. Fraser a very clear description of pantheism by the side of theism.

'Intermediate between the deistical conception of an idle God, outside Nature, and the pantheistic conception of God as the Universe in its substantial and potential infinity, is the theistic conception of the universe of experience as a revelation—an incomplete revelation—of God : God expressed in the contents of space and time, but not exhausted in the expression—and, above all, not so expressed in the contents of space and time as that whatever enters into temporal existence is finally necessitated to appear ; so that there is no room for ideals of duty, or for the rise into existence of anything that ought not to appear, and that therefore could not be finally necessitated to appear' (p. 151).

Minds of a mystical, devout, and poetical character are specially in danger of trespassing into pantheistic language. Dr. Fraser rightly vindicates Wordsworth from the charge of pantheism (p. 155). Of real pantheism he adduces as examples Erigena and Spinoza. These are names which suggest an interesting consideration about pantheism, that even by its most methodical advocates it is often held in combination (not reconciliation) with a love of God which is properly theistic. We think that, if space allowed, a plea might be made on behalf of Erigena. And Mr. Balfour, after impaling Spinoza with a quiverful of sarcastic epigrams, allows that it is Spinoza's 'religious imagination' which renders him permanently attractive.¹ Dr. Fraser refers to a characteristically shrewd remark of Coleridge to the effect that Spinoza's confirmed innocence of life, into which the conviction of sin and struggle hardly entered, 'blinded him to the defects of a doctrine which seems to overturn morality in a theory of necessitated existence, which he nevertheless describes as ethical theology' (p. 165).

For it is just in its exclusion of morality that pantheism

¹ *Foundations of Belief*, p. 243.

fails
mu
close
finite
finite
it is
deal
whic
till w
is its
solu
limit
nite,
must
plan
acco
itself
Subs
mere
nega
to sa
to di
obser
freed
use I
bular
is no
ing i
solub
once
respo
theist
no m
math
mech
U
been
Each
tain f
asked
moral
Must
Univ
in va

fails to answer the question of the universe. Otherwise it has much to say for itself. It puts into a dogmatic form that close yet mysterious connexion between the finite and the infinite which meets us in all our deeper thoughts. This place is finite, yet it is included in immensity. This time is bounded, yet it is 'somehow connected with timeless eternity.' When we deal with changes we cannot avoid the thought of the Power which originates changes. We trace causation step by step till we arrive in the presence of an inconceivable Cause which is itself uncaused. What wonder if many minds welcome a solution (if it be a solution) which identifies each of these limited and changeable objects with the Unchangeable Infinite, and calls them all modes of God? Only such a solution must bravely ignore the points which likewise crave an explanation. How, if there be but one Substance, are we to account for its limitations in phenomena? Is it limited by itself? That suggests a sort of duality after all in the prime Substance. Or is all its limitation due to an illusion—a mere *not being*? This theory seems to assign to τὸ μὴ ὂν a negative name but a very positive character; and, moreover, to say that the universe is an illusion is not to solve it but to discredit it. To assign all the terms which we learn from observation of the universe—extension, time, contingency, freedom—to that which appears, and not to that which is, is (to use Dr. Martineau's phrase) to make 'all these terms a vocabulary not of knowledge, but of negation of knowledge,'¹ and is no real solution of the world-problem at all, but an enveloping in sumptuous phrases of the confession that it is insoluble. And if all acts and thoughts are alike Divine, then, once more, 'it is in the moral experience of remorse and responsibility that an unsurmountable obstruction to pantheistic necessity seems to present itself' (p. 184). We can no more surrender the fact of conscience at the bidding of a mathematical theology than at the bidding of materialistic mechanics.

Universal Materialism, then, Panegoism, Pantheism have been summoned in turn to give their account of the universe. Each of them has offered a satisfactory explanation of certain facts of experience; but each has broken down when asked to explain what is no less a fact of experience—the moral sense, with its feelings of responsibility and remorse. Must we, then, in despair of a real solution, take refuge in Universal Nescience, and confess that our labour has been in vain, because the universe is ultimately insoluble? In

¹ *Types of Ethical Theory*, i. 308, ed. 1885.

such total scepticism 'no human mind can permanently acquiesce' (p. 209): certainly not the so-called agnostic, whose faith in the rigidity of natural laws is assured, and who knows so much about the Absolute as to know that It is, and must be, unknowable. Nevertheless, if, as we think, a reaction is in progress against the dogmatism of materialistic science, it is not impossible that Pyrrho may succeed to Epicurus, and the children of those who denied all possibility of knowledge of God will equally deny all possibility of knowledge of the universe.

Let us, then, turn at last to estimate with Dr. Fraser the solution of the universe which is offered by Theism, which does not exclude the existence of a material world in which God is inherent and interpreted, and of man, supernatural and the supreme interpretation of God. But before we summarize Dr. Fraser's arguments on this subject we would pursue a little investigation without his guidance into the nature of Reason, and the sense in which belief in God may be called reasonable.

We find that man (and perhaps man alone among the inhabitants of this world) perceives the existence and value of Truth. Drawn in many directions by many needs and appetites, he is conscious of a supreme need of Truth. Till he finds it he is restless; when he finds it (or thinks he finds it) he rests in it; it is, as it were, part of himself, or at least he is conscious of a sort of congruity between himself and that which he has discovered. What name shall we give to this sensitivity of man to Truth? We propose to call it Reason, and to define Reason as the man himself as related to Truth.

But then we notice that there are various faculties by which the Reason comes into contact with Truth. Sometimes the channel is the bodily senses, when the eye or the ear report to the Reason the experienced facts of the physical world. Sometimes the æsthetic faculty, perceiving the real beauty of this or that combination of sounds or colours, reports to the Reason beauty as a form of truth. Again, there is that intuitive faculty which apprehends axiomatic truth, such as the axioms of mathematics, the real existence of the universe, the causation by which it is ordered; this faculty also brings its report to the Reason. Further, the same or a similar faculty apprehends intuitively the distinction between right and wrong, and the obligatory character of the right; and this too it reports to the Reason. And, finally, the mass of mankind has, or claims to have, a faculty by which it

disc
is re
we h
have
its o
our
the
with
infa
a rig
ous.
whic
they
P
ence
take
them
othe
to th
provi
of se
so lo
tion
not a
facul
not q
conso
the t
logica
vitiat
Roma
that l
appre
the m
nome
the lo
It
that a
reason
recogn
as par
The l
which
1 S
spiritua

discerns, or thinks it discerns, God; and this experience likewise is reported to the Reason. Now each of these faculties of which we have spoken deals with experiences; we have, or think we have, an actual, direct, experiential knowledge of the world, of its orderliness, of a moral law, of God. No doubt many of our supposed experiences may be found erroneous; those of the eye are often so notoriously, and the like may be the case with experiences of moral law and of God. We do not claim infallibility for any of these faculties of experience, but only a right to be listened to before they are put aside as erroneous. And because they all report themselves to the Reason, which forms the central unity and reconciliation of them all, they may all be called reasonable.

Besides these faculties of experience we notice the existence of another faculty of a different order—a faculty which takes the reports of the experiential faculties and criticizes them, comparing them with other reports of the same or other faculties. In this way it may be regarded as secondary to the faculties of experience. To this faculty we may give provisionally the name of the logical faculty. It is, indeed, of secondary moment what names we give to these faculties, so long as we do not overlook the central and supreme position of what we have called Reason, so long also as we do not ascribe to the logical faculty and deny to the perceptive faculties the title of 'reasonable.' Possibly Dr. Fraser has not quite avoided this danger; for he uses the term 'rational consciousness' (p. 251) for what we have called Reason, and the term 'reasoning' (p. 220) to denote the operation of the logical faculty. The confusion on this point to our mind vitiates much of Mr. Kidd's social theory, and much of Mr. Romanes's *Thoughts on Religion*. What we contend for is that logic is no more rational than perception; perception apprehends truth, logic criticizes the percept, the Reason is the man himself as the ultimate referee. Perhaps no better nomenclature can be used than that of Coleridge, who calls the logical faculty the 'understanding.'¹

It follows from these considerations, if they be accepted, that a human percept has a *prima facie* claim to be considered reasonable. Logic does not make a thing reasonable, it only recognizes it as reasonable—*i.e.* as a real percept, not an error, as part of the universal truth with which man is congruous. The little child is reasonable in its perception of a truth which the philosopher, no more reasonably, holds firmly after

¹ See especially *Aids to Reflection*, Aph. 8, 'on that which is indeed spiritual Religion,' and appendix.

it has been sifted by a long process of scientific logic. The Swiss peasant sees every day when he wakes the same mountain which the English tourist sees only after a long and costly journey. The sight is the same; the process by which each person attains to it is different. Moreover every perception, by whatever faculty received, may justly claim what we habitually concede to the perceptions received through the bodily senses, that it be treated as veridical until it is shown to be fallacious. We cannot express our meaning better than in some words used by Mr. Tollemache in his recent *Memoir of Benjamin Jowett*, that 'the use of logic is less for the discovery of truth than for the detection of error, and less for the detection of error than for its exposure.' Logic is like the chemical process which oxidises away the baser metals and leaves the better of gold. It did not dig the ore, or put it into the crucible; and the gold is gold, whether it be found in the crucible or in the rock. When, then, a man asserts that he is conscious of God—and this assertion is made implicitly by the great mass of mankind—his assertion must not be exempt from criticism; yet it has a *prima facie* claim to be accepted. If his neighbour does not possess this consciousness this is no proof that it is fallacious, any more than the insensibility of some persons to music proves that in Beethoven there is no more than a jangle of noises.

It has next to be noticed in our estimate of the logical faculty that this faculty cannot operate without the assumption of something supralogical. Of course it must have perceptions to deal with before it can act at all. Moreover we cannot argue except on the assumption that logical processes are valid, and this conviction is an act of faith, not of logic. It cannot be proved logically that certain molecular conditions of eye and brain are caused by light emitted from a star millions of miles away; yet astronomy rests on the assumption that this is so. It cannot be proved logically that the order of the universe exists, or indeed the universe itself, except in the mind that thinks it; yet every natural science starts from an act of faith which discredits Panegoism. We believe in time and space and causation, though there can never be any logical proof of them, and though the attempt to prove them leads us into inevitable contradictions. The major premiss of every syllogism is an act of faith, for we know, but we cannot prove, that things are so related that a general proposition can be made about them. And perhaps the conclusion of every syllogism is equally an act of faith; for it is difficult to see how, from the consideration of two

truth
feet
but t
the
Dr. I
scien
arres
a pu
tion
cons
justi
219.

V
not t
in co
cann
tion
with
cosm
cons
sequ
hypo
soun
his h
and
mind
isola
be t
cosm
By e
faith
these
hypo
and
intui
alter
expe
coun
strat
may
the p
A
a wo
many
they
vo

truths, we can arrive at a third truth except on the winged feet of direct perception. The logical faculty clears the eye, but the perception of the new truth is of the same sort with the perception of other truths. We cordially accept, then, Dr. Fraser's assertion: 'The agnosticism that retains physical science is not really a protest against faith; it is only an arrest of faith at the point at which faith advances from a purely physical to the moral and religious interpretation of life and the universe.' The later part of his book considers the question, 'Is an arrest of faith *at this point* justified by reason or by the experience of mankind?' (p. 219.)

We are not sure that we can endorse, or perhaps we do not understand, Dr. Fraser's expression, 'The scientific trust in cosmical order, on which all inductive verification depends, cannot itself be proved by experience, because no interpretation of experience is possible unless this faith is accepted without proof' (p. 223). It seems to us that this faith in cosmic order must indeed exist as a hypothesis before we can consider the universe at all, but that it may be proved subsequently by scientific logic. Champollion started with the hypothesis that certain hieroglyphics represented certain sounds; he tested his belief by a logical process, comparing his hypothesis with experiences gained from other sources, and found it partly corrected, partly proved. Imagine a mind confronted with a number of observed facts: are they isolated or are they correlated? Whichever account of them be true we cannot even think of them unless a belief in cosmic order is present (at least hypothetically) in our mind. By experience we perceive, or think we perceive, facts; by faith we perceive, or think we perceive, truths which unite these facts in a certain general relation; by logic we test this hypothetical relation, confronting it with other experiences and other beliefs. Or, if anyone prefers to call faith or intuition itself a form of experience, we make no scruple, but alter our phrase thus: That intuition, or faith, or spiritual experience is, in the minds which are capable of it, the counterpart of physical experience, and the necessary substratum of any rational reading of phenomena: that logic may test experience, may correct it, but cannot possibly take the place of it.

Apply these observations to belief in God. We stand in a world of phenomena, in which, as a matter of fact, very many profess to be conscious of God. It is not only that they calculate up to God as the best solution for problems

else insoluble, but that some of them in definite language, and more in the habitual temper of their lives, bear witness that they are somehow conscious of God. We do not claim for this conviction universality or infallibility, but only that it exists, and that widely. What has the logical faculty to say to it? If it can prove that God does not and cannot exist, if it can prove that the existence of such a Being is inconsistent with other facts and beliefs already tested and established, then the belief in God must be cast out. But if it does no more than show that this belief is not inevitable, and may not be true, the belief will survive. It did not ask logic to prove it inevitable, but only to test its possibility. Logic may, indeed, detect and destroy many mistakes about the God whom men claim to discern; it may prove that He is not many, but One, that He is not an old Man seated on the top of a Greek hill and wielding thunderbolts, that He is not capricious, and suchlike points. After all such misconceptions have been cleared away is there anything substantial left of the original belief? Surely everything; for the Christian philosopher's purified conception of God is certainly not less vital and effective than that of the heathen. Faith chastened by logic brings in to the Reason only a part of her original report; but it is the essential part, more vigorous because pruned of excrescences. Shall we say, then, that this faith is unreasonable? It is to Reason that faith reports itself. Or, if anyone calls this a juggle of words, shall we say that this faith is illogical? It has stood the test of logic, it has been cleared of accretions by logic; it is true that it never took its rise out of logic, but neither did any other sort of experience. The question to be borne in mind is not, 'Does logic demonstrate the existence of God?' but, 'Does logic contradict the human perception of God?' It may not—we think it does not—lie within the scope of science to demonstrate the existence of a creative Mind: does it contradict the belief or intuition of such a Mind which indubitably exists? Agnosticism is the confession that science cannot 'by searching' (Job xi. 7)—*i.e.* by logical process—'find out God,' and we personally have no quarrel with this assertion. But when agnostics go beyond agnosticism, and assert that what cannot be known by one line of investigation cannot be known at all, but only fancied, this is only a dogmatic denial of all other channels of knowledge than the senses, and all other legitimate ways of dealing with perceptions than the logical. It is to disregard or disparage that intuition or faith which is the only possible groundwork of science, and

with
act

The
the
phy
Cau
It w
inde
end
at th
soev
the
the
Wha
put
enou
have
econ
men
only
not
the r
of ca
anot
only
whic
more
univ
bute
'whic

T
tions
caus
univ
temp
mani
trans
had
but S
St. A
at no
harm
in tim

without the presence of which the logical faculty can no more act than a judge can act without a suitor and his suit.

We return from this digression to the work before us. The human experience of God may be said to yield under the analysis of logic two primary elements, the one metaphysical, the other ethical—that there is, and must be, a Cause of causes, and that this Cause is, and must be, moral. It will not satisfy our thought of causation to imagine an indefinitely prolonged chain of causes, with God at the further end of it. God is not the First Cause in the sense of standing at the head of such a chain of causes. For at what point soever of such a chain of causes we stop short and say, This is the first, the human mind cannot be satisfied without asking, What lay before that first? It is the question which children put: 'God made the world, but who made God?' It is not enough to say, with Dr. Chalmers (quoted on p. 228), that 'we have proof of a commencement to our present *material* economy, but we have no such proof of such a commencement to the *mental* economy—*i.e.* the Divine Mind'; for this only means that possibly God may not have been caused, not that He is uncaused. The First Cause must be not only the remote beginning of a long chain of causes, but the Cause of causes—that which enables one thing to be the cause of another: that is to say, it must be superior in nature, and not only prior in order, to all secondary causes, and the only Cause which fully satisfies our notion of causation. If causation be more than the observed sequence of events—*i.e.* if the universe has a principle of order in itself, and not only attributed to it by our minds—then there must be the Cause which makes other causes to be causes.

The recognition of such a First Cause by no means questions the existence, or limits the extension, of secondary causes. Dr. Fraser evidently leans to the opinion that the universe may consist of an infinite series of changes, without temporal beginning or end, by which the creative Mind manifests Itself—the creaturely language into which it ever translates Itself. Such a conception of the universe as having had no beginning in time is not common among Christians; but St. Thomas Aquinas rejects it with much hesitation,¹ and St. Augustine says that 'God was before creation, though at no time before it.'² It seems not more difficult to harmonize with theism than the thought of a creation begun in time; and it has the advantage of enabling us to give the

¹ *Summa*, I. xlv. 1-3; *Summa c. Gent.* ii. 18, 31-38.

² *De Civ. Dei*, xii. 15.

same meaning to *ἐν ἀρχῇ* in the first verse of Genesis and in the first verse of St. John.

The universe, then, may be, or may not be, an unbeginning and unending series of causations. In either case it requires a First Cause not merely to start at a remote point the series, but to make it a series at all—a Cause which imparts to creatures the power of causation. And this Cause is rational, because (except on the plea of Universal Nescience, which has been found impossible) the universe is capable of rational interpretation, and our whole practical as well as scientific life is based upon the conviction that this rational interpretation is possible. The parallel between language as the expression of thought and matter as the expression of Spirit, to which Dr. Fraser several times alludes, is worked out with great skill in Miss Caillard's remarkable book, *Progressive Revelation*.

St. Paul defines the province of natural theology when he declares that 'the invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things which are made, even His everlasting power and divinity.'¹ We have observed how the surrounding universe bears witness to an inevitable Cause of causes, which is rational: does it also disclose His goodness? Dr. Fraser maintains—we think rightly—that the evidence of this is to be sought, not in the world at large, but in man himself. There has undoubtedly been a strong reaction from the old method of tracing in the world signs of God's goodness. We do not say that they are not there; but we are bound to confess that the world bears equally vivid testimony to a power which is not good. An earth which is the tomb of generations of men and brutes, evolution carried out at the cost of a relentless struggle for existence, the prevalence of pain, and the universality of death, seem rather to indicate a pessimistic than an optimistic solution of the universe. And the Christian religion, with the emphasis which it lays on sin, its declaration that 'the whole world lieth in the evil one,'² and its teaching of the Death which alone destroys death, cannot be charged with indifference to the darker side of things. In fact, it exactly corresponds to experience when it teaches that, though God made the world, we do not see it as He made it, but as an enemy has defaced it. But when we turn our eyes within we perceive, no doubt, the same prevalence of evil which we see in the world; yet in the power which we have to detect and to condemn evil—in our consciousness of a moral

¹ Rom. i. 20, R.V.

² 1 John v. 19.

law
that
evil
does
shall
might
to c
no
It i
inve
of r
Rig
alik
serie
con
thes
per
mor
lang
perc

in na
natu
both
Each
myst
part,
phys
high
it' (1

inclu
them
lectu
who
cons
that
that
sear
of H
with
(p. 2
tion
so m

law and of our responsibility to obey it—we find a testimony that the Intelligence which made us loves good and hates evil. The verdict of conscience is in the imperative mood; it does not say, 'This were wisely or preferably done,' but, 'This shalt thou do.' It reveals Right, not as that which a man might prudently choose to do, but as that which he is bound to do. It is the weakness of pure materialism that it leaves no room for moral responsibility in a mechanical universe. It is the weakness of Panegoism that it makes the mind invent its own moral standard, and conscience echo the voice of no higher tribunal. It is the weakness of Pantheism that Right and Wrong are the names given by ignorance to actions alike Divine. It is the strength of Theism that it gives as serious a place to man's conception of Right as it does to his conception of existence, or of causation, or of order. Alike these conceptions are not merely man's imaginations, but his perceptions of the Cause of the universe as orderly, intelligent, moral. He interprets by himself—because he has no higher language in which to express his thoughts—so much as he perceives of the Cause of all.

'The ideal man, including his body, is for us the symbol of God in nature' (p. 253).

'In man two ultimate mysteries seem to meet—the mystery of natural causation, and the mystery of moral or immoral will . . . both alike incompletely intelligible at the scientific point of view. Each conception, necessarily incomplete, is therefore necessarily mysterious for an intelligence that can comprehend or judge only in part, and not at the eternal or infinite centre . . . Scientific faith in physical necessity need not subvert moral or religious faith in what is higher than physical necessity, yet not necessarily inconsistent with it' (pp. 257 sq.).

We have seen the testimony borne by the universe including man, to a First Cause, intelligent and moral. What, then, is God? To this question Dr. Fraser devotes his last lecture, professing himself to be much of Simonides' mind, who asked of Hiero a delay, daily doubled, that he might consider his answer to the question. We are rightly reminded that there is a Christian agnosticism—an acknowledgment that 'we know' only 'in part,' that 'His judgments are unsearchable, and His ways past finding out.' Our knowledge of Him gives us 'fragments only of the infinite Reality—if without absurdity we may speak of a fragment of infinity' (p. 290). Possibly it would be better to speak of a 'condition' than of a 'fragment': we know of the Divine Reality so much as can be expressed in human language. But the

case is the same with religious faith and with scientific faith. The latter can never get an exhaustive thought of matter, of extension, of time, of causation; the former can never get an exhaustive thought of God. But what is not exhaustive may yet be true—so much of the Truth as befits our present condition. The constitution of the human mind forbids us to sink resignedly into nescience. Man justifies himself by accepting all that experience, duly criticized, teaches him, whether of the material world around him, or of the moral world within him, or of the ultimate mystery which envelops him and the universe alike. And, standing at this point, man will not, if he is wise, turn a deaf ear of prejudice to the records of the experience of others which goes beyond his own.

We will end with a practical suggestion. It has been seen how pure Materialism, Panegoism, Pantheism, all go to pieces on the rock of the Moral Consciousness—a rock on which Theism builds itself a fortress. Does not this indicate that the practical refutation of those theories will come from development of the moral sense? We do not for a moment mean that we ought to lay aside thought and entrust the defence of Theism to emotion, or to embody it in practical action without an intellectual basis. But we mean that the moral sense supplies us with a form of experience without which the problem of the universe will be presented in a defective form. We dare not overlook the experience of the conscience any more than we dare overlook the experience of the eye or the ear. And the conscience, like the bodily senses, can be trained to more and more delicate susceptibility. He who has diligently exercised his conscience will be less likely than another to regard himself as a minor wheel in an immoral machinery of atomic necessity; he will be less likely to regard his own mind as the ultimate standard of Right; he will be less likely to worship a god who is equally and alike the source of virtue and the source of vice.

ART. V.

Charles

Sav

Oxy

AD

wor

Wo

cess

por

THE p
remark
Pritch
itself b
this bo
preface
of his
compa
us, and
Pritch
greatn
been m
of ma
Samue
curred
that w
joint a
of so
Johns
as ma
the be
cal fra
Eric's
alone
descri
Menta
ing, a
Johns
that s
as a t
firm h
humb
tation

ART. VII.—MEMOIRS OF PROFESSOR PRITCHARD.

Charles Pritchard, D.D., F.R.S., F.R.A.S., F.R.G.S.: Late Savilian Professor of Astronomy in the University of Oxford: Memoirs of his Life. Compiled by his daughter, ADA PRITCHARD. With an account of his theological work by the Right Reverend the LORD BISHOP of WORCESTER, and of his astronomical work by his successor, Professor H. A. TURNER, F.R.A.S. With a portrait. (London, 1897.)

THE promptings of our own immense admiration for the very remarkable and many-sided genius of the late Professor Pritchard, whose name, as his daughter rightly feels, 'will itself be deemed sufficient justification for the publication of this book' (Preface, p. v), incite us to plunge at once without preface into the subject, and put before our readers the story of his career. But before doing so we must rid ourselves of a comparison which has haunted us as we read the book before us, and which may help some who did not know Professor Pritchard, either personally or by sight, to appreciate the greatness of his character. We must confess that we have been much struck by certain resemblances, in spite of course of many differences, between Professor Pritchard and Dr. Samuel Johnson. The comparison, when it has once occurred to the mind, is so curiously exact in some of its details, that we are surprised that it did not occur to any one of the joint authors of Professor Pritchard's life. There is a likeness of some sort in body, mind, and soul. Pritchard, like Johnson, had, as many an Oxford man will remember, and as may be inferred from a glance at the excellent portrait at the beginning of the book, a large and slowly moving physical frame. The reader will see allusions to this in his son Eric's description of the 'wonderful month' which he spent alone with his father abroad in 1878 (pp. 117-8), and in the description of 'adventurous donkey-rides' in Egypt (p. 134). Mentally, he was distinguished for robust powers of reasoning, and a clearness of penetration, which recall some of Johnson's most forcible arguments; and he had to the full that sturdy gift of common sense which distinguished Johnson as a typical Briton. In his spiritual life he combined that firm hold upon the verities of the faith with that profoundly humble Christian spirit which makes the 'Prayers and Meditations' of Dr. Johnson one of the treasures of English

devotional literature, while he was almost as unfamiliar as Johnson, by necessity, was with the religious atmosphere in which the Tractarian leaders were at home. But the comparison goes further than this. Johnson was what Boswell's father contemptuously called a 'dominie'; so with enormous credit to himself was Pritchard in his earlier years. If Johnson lived in familiar intercourse with a great artist of his day, Sir Joshua Reynolds, so did Pritchard with Mr. Ruskin (see, for example, p. 115). If Johnson's great fame was in strong contrast with his early disadvantages, so too was Pritchard's (p. 11). And if Johnson was a doughty champion of Christian faith and morals in the midst of his untoward generation, doing more useful service than many of his dignified clerical contemporaries, so did Pritchard use his scientific attainments for the defence of the truths of revelation, in a way which surpassed the efforts of many of his fellow clergymen who were more specially engaged in ecclesiastical employment. If Clarendon's noble and masterly description of Lord Falkland appeared to Boswell to be an admirable expression of parts of Dr. Johnson's character, we may justly say the same with regard to Pritchard:

'Such an immenseness of wit, such a solidity of judgment, so infinite a fancy, bound in by a most logical ratiocination! His acquaintance was cultivated by the most polite and accurate men; so that his house was an university in less volume, whither they came, not so much for repose as study, and to examine and refine those grosser propositions which laziness and consent made current in conversation.'¹

We may say that although, alas! no Boswell has been found to write the Life of Pritchard, yet his children and his friends have done their best to supply his place, and have so arranged the Memoirs that each part of Pritchard's life has been described in nearly every case by the writer best qualified to form an estimate of it. We may conclude the comparison which we have drawn by mentioning that Professor Pritchard's relative, Mrs. Pritchard the actress, who is perhaps responsible for the Pritchards' love of the stage, in spite of their Calvinistic principles and education (p. 5), was twice criticized by Dr. Johnson;² and it was, we suspect, this lady's name which suggested the comparison to us.

I. Charles Pritchard was born at Brixton on February 28, 1808, as is now undoubtedly ascertained, although, like his contemporary Manning, he was himself uncertain of the year

¹ Quoted in Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, iii. 501, note 1, ed. Napier.

² Boswell's *Life*, ii. 177; iv. 103.

of his birth (pp. 8, 14). His name is Boswell. He has been as Pritchard a high politician. London has elected him in the Indies, and indeed, though during the Church of England ladies of the gossip (his mind? ¹) distant countries quite as much as even the say that Professor Pritchard's reminiscences never cease to be boisterous, alas! put 'shifted' an elder brother in some sense there coming, rather as a size, luckily his relative fled.

'My collected friend a cooler friend. As an instance with the sensation, the to ask for this I read friend wrote

Mrs. frankly told

¹ In 2 i. 390.

of his birth, and once, at least, made a mistake about it (pp. 8, 147). He came of an old Shropshire family, whose name is said to have signified a native of Picardy, and to have been confused with the Welsh Ap-Richard, anglicized as Pritchard (compare Richardson). It is significant of the high political feelings of the times that his father moved to London because he found Shropshire unbearable, after a fierce election in 1801, when voters were brought from the West Indies, and Shrewsbury was drowned in strong ale (p. 8). Indeed, the picture of life in the county at that period and during the first half of this century is very diverting. If the *Church Quarterly Review* is so fortunate as to number great ladies of fashion among its readers, they will enjoy the bits of gossip (has not gossip been described as the coffee of the mind?)¹ about the Hunt Ball in 1841, when 'the cool and distant civility of the "great ladies" to Mrs. Disraeli was quite as noticeable as the fact that *her* diamonds outshone even the splendid Powys heirlooms' (p. 3). We need hardly say that this is the narrative of a lady—Mrs. Ogier Ward, Professor Pritchard's niece—who was chosen to give the reminiscences of his early life. As a child, Pritchard, who never ceased to be child-like, fully shared the family love of boisterous rollicking fun, and his troublesome pranks were, alas! punished just as much as moral offences. He was 'shifted about to four different schools.' At one of these his elder brother, at the age of 16, was to be found 'sitting' apart in some solitary corner with his Aristophanes in his hand, and there convulsed with laughter' (p. 10). He went, a promising, rather uncouth lad, up to St. John's College, Cambridge, as a sizar. In the Tripos he was fourth wrangler. Unluckily his nervous temperament was worried by a gesticulative fidgety man in the next seat. He says himself:

'My besetting infirmity' was 'a certain nervousness or uncollectedness, which prevented my producing at the moment what in a cooler frame of mind was well within the scope of my knowledge. As an instance of this, I may mention that on one winter's midnight, with the snow upon the ground, and within a week of the examination, the most distinguished man of the year came into my rooms to ask for the explanation of a knotty point in the Lunar Theory; this I readily gave him. The question itself was actually set; my friend wrote it out—I did not!' (pp. 41-2).

Mrs. Ward's interesting chapter is no mere eulogy. She frankly tells us that as she knew him her uncle was 'highly

¹ In *The Spectator*, Sept. 15, 1888; cf. Liddon, *Advent Sermons*, i. 390.

irritable' as well as 'highly gifted' (p. 23). She puts before us the best account which we have seen of Pritchard as a preacher (pp. 16-18), and gives comments on his character and later history which carry us on to the next period of his life.

II. Here we are introduced to Pritchard as a school-master, and our authority is an autobiographical work addressed to 'old boys,' entitled *Annals of our School Life*, the bulk of which Miss Pritchard has placed in her second chapter (p. 24), and which she supplements by a chapter of illustrative reminiscences by pupils and others. She is herself conscious (pref. p. v) that the method pursued has of necessity interfered somewhat with chronological sequence, and we have in fact to construct our own table of events—to choose between conflicting statements ('four years' labours' on p. 141 appears as 'the work of three years' on p. 286), and even in such important matters as his election to a fellowship to choose between dates (1832 on p. 44, 1833 on p. 320), and to go to *Crockford* for the years of his ordination to the diaconate and the priesthood (1833 and 1834), which are not mentioned in the Index, nor, so far as we can see, in any part of the Memoirs. While we are relieving ourselves of this little complaint, we may express our regret that more care has not been taken to correct misprints and make good deficiencies in the type. Such errors occur on p. viii., p. 7, line 1; p. 82, line 3; p. 133 ('off' for 'of'); p. 135, line 12; p. 138 ('Preßwich' for 'Prestwich'); p. 177 (the omission of a quotation mark in line 9); p. 232, line 11; p. 252, line 8; p. 263, line 6 in the footnote; p. 266, last line; p. 309, last line but one. There are also some ungrammatical sentences, such as 'a Pritchard married to a Lloyd were his parents' (p. 2); 'most usual' (p. 99); and there is a disturbed heading on p. 164. We suspect also that St. Matthew's, Nottingham, is a misprint for St. Mary's, on p. 91. The omission of such corrections mars the pleasure of readers, while the absence of sufficient chronological guide-posts delays them on the road if they desire to accompany Pritchard through his life.

To his scholastic work Pritchard brought the fame of his high position in the Tripos, the fact of his classical fellowship, his success as a Smith's Prizeman, a love of teaching, and what was at that time a novel conception of education. All school-masters who are engaged in teaching boys of the classes for which Stockwell and Clapham Grammar Schools were intended, and all parents who take a reasonable interest in the training of their own growing lads, will find that Pritchard's

views
practic
of their
such ol
68), Si
Mr. G.
the com
How e
the tou
remind
Newcom
passing
ful sto
His ma
this, as
assisted
capacit
meanin
diction
purpos
hours o
increm
chemist
those d
observa
nasia.
buoyan
deliciou
roused
experim
electric
holiday
six boy
back to
flowers
dred ya
light o
master
(p. 59).
inspired
with th
genius
own m
that his
stances

views on education and his methods of putting them into practice deserve the closest attention. What the boys thought of their master and his ways may be read in the testimony of such old pupils as the present dean of Westminster (pp. 43, 68), Sir George Grove (p. 71), Sir W. Herschel (p. 73), and Mr. G. Hemming, who became Senior Wrangler, and is now the consulting counsel to the University of Cambridge (p. 52). How enduring was their affection for their master appears in the touching revival of the roll-call at the Old Boys' dinner, reminding us of a pathetic passage in the last chapter of *The Newcomes* (p. 141). We can hardly do more than refer in passing to the vast amount of wisdom and the many delightful stories which belong to this part of Pritchard's career. His main intention was to develop a habit of thinking, and this, as it is significant to observe, he believed to be greatly assisted by the small problems within the reach of a boy's capacity, which constantly occur in the groping out of the meaning of Greek and Latin sentences by the aid solely of dictionary and grammar (p. 48, cf. p. 56). His next wise purpose was to provide his boys with resources for the leisure hours of maturer life, by the systematic accumulation of small increments of knowledge (pp. 48, 50)—botany, mechanics, chemistry, astronomy, and the like. In his view, rarer in those days than now, a school must have its laboratory, its observatory, and its fives-courts, swimming baths, and gymnasium. His own joyous grasp of a demonstration imparted a buoyancy to his mode of teaching, and he gives really a delicious description of a Euclid class (p. 58), and so keenly roused the interest of a boy in some of Faraday's beautiful experiments for the establishment of the fundamentals of electricity that 'the lad shouted for joy' (p. 73). A half-holiday to the whole school was the inducement held out if six boys could hand in a required demonstration, or bring back to school and intelligently explain specimens of wild flowers illustrative of twelve natural orders, or swim a hundred yards (pp. 58, 60, 62). A passage which throws much light on the sympathetic mind of Pritchard as a school-master is a paragraph on the Greek definition of proportion (p. 59). Morally his teaching was of the soundest kind. He inspired his boys with a high sense of honour (pp. 18, 61), with the importance of perseverance, especially in relation to genius (p. 73), and was heartily free from cant (p. 61). His own methodical way of working was so exact and precise that his boys could not but be influenced by it. Striking instances may be found of this mental habit under various cir-

cumstances. He says calmly that 70,000 careful astronomical measures can be made by steady and systematic accumulation without any stress of mind in less than a year (p. 50). He gave daily attention to his horticultural diaries, making careful little entries about the smallest matters (p. 149). Before a tour he would draw up a complete itinerary from start to finish (p. 118), and his son, who went with him into Notre Dame when the entire cathedral was draped in mourning for Pope Pius IX., tells us 'it was highly characteristic of my dear old father that he should improve the occasion by making me calculate how many yards of cloth were hanging on the walls, and at a rough estimate how much it would cost the ecclesiastical authorities' (p. 119).

The wisdom of Pritchard's remarks on deterrent punishments is only to our mind equalled by his humour. One short extract will supply a fine sample of both. 'Corporeal correction, provided it is not regarded as disgraceful, appears to me to be the readiest and least objectionable mode of punishment for a young boy, say under sixteen; it should not be either excessive or insufficient; neither should it be frequent. I generally offered the alternative of an equivalent in cube roots, the former being in almost all cases accepted; but if so, there was also an intermediate condition to the effect that the culprit should not exhibit his sense of inconvenience by any concurrent sound' (p. 63).

Spiritually his own grave piety set its mark upon the boys' lives for endless good. He made the school chapel and its accessories a very distinctive and important element in the educational discipline (pp. 64, 78, 109), took immense pains to procure good glass for the windows and the best music for the services, rarely missed a choir-practice, had an annual Confirmation, and surrounded the place with an atmosphere of quiet reverence (pp. 65-7). His maxim was, 'Whatever you do, do it as well as you can'; and he capped the old excuse, 'Please, sir, I did not intend it,' by the remark, 'No doubt you did not *that*, but you ought to have intended the *reverse*.' And there, as he justly observes, is one of the secrets of the success of the Clapham education (p. 67).

III. A longing for a time of quiet country life led to the transfer of the school at Clapham to other hands, and to seven peaceful years of unofficial life at Freshwater from 1862 to 1870, filled with theological and astronomical study. It will be appropriate to group under this period of comparative repose all that we have to say of Mr. Pritchard's domestic life, and then to deal with him in his public professional life as a

theolog
Pritch
directi
of his
see so
clergy
life Pr
family
his jou
Garden

'Fr
and ne
which
known
market
banter
always
forgotte
new m
usual.
graver
the pe
Compe
fantasti
down r
compet
better p
to us fu
and ill
interest
and car

For
Pritch
illustra
(pp. 5
dog B
(pp. 1
with h
the tw
furnish
well as
Societ
detail

¹ W
love for
puffs (p

theologian and an astronomer. It was during this time that Pritchard's great powers developed themselves in many directions and prepared him for taking the eminent position of his later years. It is commonly observed that no children see so little of their father as the sons and daughters of a busy clergyman or other professional man. But at all times of his life Pritchard found time for the joyous abandonment of family life. Never did he forget his children, or his wife. On his journeys to London he very much enjoyed a visit to Covent Garden Market.

'From thence he usually secured some novelty in horticulture, and never left without one of the Covent Garden sorted salads,¹ which he always regarded as unequalled. He was quite a well-known character amongst the old ladies who plied their trade in the market, and was always greeted with a smile, in anticipation of the banter which invariably accompanied the purchases. We children always looked forward to the return from London. We were never forgotten. The remembrance sometimes took the form of some new mechanical toy or small trinket, but sweetmeats were most usual. Astonished indeed would those only acquainted with the graver side of his character have been, could they have witnessed the performances which marked the bestowal of these dainties. Competitions of the most varied nature, but always grotesque or fantastic, marked the occasion, and I have seen tears of mirth roll down my father's cheeks as he awarded the prizes to the eager little competitors. When he gave himself up to our amusement, no better playfellow was to be found. . . . He would recount fairy tales to us full of the wildest flights of fancy, sing us extraordinary rhymes, and illustrate nursery tales by means of the magic-lantern, with an interest of his own in the performances so keen as to be infectious and cause us endless amusement' (pp. 98-9; cp. p. 109).

For much more of this and similar delightful sides of Pritchard's life, the reader may look out the passages which illustrate his humour (pp. 112, 114, 120), his love of flowers (pp. 51, 83, 106, 115-6, 147, 149), of birds (p. 115), of his dog Bob (pp. 155-6, 163), of cribbage (p. 163), of music (pp. 115, 140), of architecture (p. 105), and his intercourse with his neighbour Tennyson (pp. 100-1). The children of the two families romped together in the hayfield, and we are furnished with one or two welcome stories about the poet, as well as the graver incident of the origin of the Metaphysical Society (p. 97). We abstain with much regret from more detailed allusion to many of these attractive little episodes,

¹ We must compare with this his inquiry about mince-pies (p. 9), his love for green tea (p. 16), his concern for the making of coffee (p. 20), and puffs (p. 121).

and content ourselves with mentioning that when we saw Pritchard for the last time he was being wheeled in his bath-chair (pp. 148, 151, 154) through St. Giles's Fair by his daughters, with characteristic dutiful attention on their part, and characteristic interest on his part in the queer scene which only those Oxford men who have 'stayed up' in the long vacation can imagine.

IV. Now we have quite failed in what has thus far been our purpose if we have not produced an impression that Pritchard was an unusually interesting man, from whose many-sided genius very great things might be expected. We have now to describe the great achievements by which he more than satisfied the highest expectations of his friends, and justified the warm congratulations of Dean Hook, who wrote to him in 1870: 'I congratulate Oxford, I congratulate the Church, I congratulate you on the appointment of the fittest man that England could produce to the Savilian Professorship' (of Astronomy) (p. 103). As a theologian alone, or as an astronomer alone, Pritchard would have been a notable man in the front ranks. It is in being both that his pre-eminent greatness consists, and that his services as a Christian apologist are so remarkable. The well-meant, but ill-judged, advice of 'a celebrated scientist' was impossible for a man like Pritchard, as will be seen, to follow. 'Do not,' he said, 'mix up theology and astronomy at Oxford. Times have changed; they like these matters kept distinct. You are there as a Professor of Science, and not as a Theologian.' And yet, as Pritchard most truly said, 'I have never attempted to separate the two' (p. 113). If we are to speak of his theology first, we must ascribe the greatest importance to his life-long deepening personal piety. As a young man at Cambridge he 'was led to commit the major part of Butler's *Analogy* to memory' (p. 40), he listened to such preachers as J. J. Blunt and Archdeacon Hare, and read Coleridge and Isaac Taylor. 'I was induced by Isaac Taylor's remarkable essay on "Saturday evening" to clear away all secular books on the early evening of the last day of the week, and during three years of my Cambridge course I devoted it and the Sunday to quiet thought, apart from academical studies' (p. 41). The account of the Bishop of Worcester, his life-long friend, shows how these influences worked themselves out in his later life (p. 79). Much later still he speaks of the reading of the Gospels, Stier's *Words of Jesus*, and some of Robertson's sermons (whose views on the scheme of redemption he did not share) (p. 198). Sir

W. He
science
after ro
fessor,
'indeed
creased
age of
hymns
mornin
that al
'was th
jecting
Bays (
at mee
Eviden
address
when
thereby
'would
touchin
his ow
mature
series
Cambr
Cambr
five oc
at thro
fugitive
cations
at his
(p. 139
signific
Butler'
which
attainm
of the
of Gen
are a f
said.
Pritcha
and un
possess
'legacy
in whic
solely

W. Herschel speaks of 'his constant reference as a man of science to the Giver of all Knowledge' (p. 76). Immediately after receiving the news of his appointment as Savilian Professor, he 'resorted early to the house of God,' and was 'indeed full of a deep sense of humility,' which rather increased than diminished as years went on (p. 106). At the age of eighty-four, he says in a letter that there were three hymns which he conned daily—'Holy, holy, holy' in the morning, 'Rock of Ages' in the evening, and 'Father, I know that all my life' at noon (p. 160). The chapel at Clapham 'was the pride of his life' (p. 77); he busied himself in projecting a little church for the people at Totland and Alum Bays (pp. 88-9); he studied Hebrew (p. 145), or he presided at meetings of the Oxford Bible Society and the Christian Evidence Society (p. 113), or he went to Northampton and addressed an assembly of Mr. Bradlaugh's adherents (p. 128) when he thought that a useful purpose might be served thereby. His horror of affectation in early life, we are told, 'would often lead him, after uttering some beautiful and touching sentiment, to turn it off with a jest, as if deprecating his own sincerity and emotion' (p. 17). But as his life matured he gave public signs of his earnest purpose in a series of very noble discourses, as Hulsean Lecturer at Cambridge in 1867, as Select Preacher both at Oxford and Cambridge, as a preacher before the British Association on five occasions, notably at Nottingham in 1866, as a speaker at three Church Congresses, and as the author of many fugitive articles in *Good Words*, and some valuable communications to the *Dictionary of the Bible*. He left unfinished at his death a treatise on the Gospel in St. Paul's writings (p. 139). In the general drift of his theological teaching it is significant to observe how much Pritchard was influenced by Butler's teaching. It is the analogy between nature and grace which is his favourite topic (see p. 176), while his scientific attainments found scope in articles on such subjects as 'the star of the Magi,' the battle of Bethhoron, and the 'creation proem of Genesis' (p. 177), or in a contest with Colenso (p. 84). These are a few special topics on which something more ought to be said. The Bishop of Worcester was expressly desired by Pritchard before his death to render an account of him 'as true and unvarnished' as possible. It is certain that the Bishop possessed a unique qualification for the due discharge of this 'legacy' (p. 171); but it is by no means certain from the letter in which the request was conveyed that Pritchard referred solely or even specially to his religious convictions, and we

find some reasons for supposing, on the Bishop's own evidence, that Pritchard would have changed the order of the sections, even if he had not softened or suppressed more than one passage, in this part of the Memoirs. The fact is, to speak frankly, we see a little too much of the Bishop's own proclivities in some paragraphs which he has contributed to the work. In giving an account of Pritchard's attitude towards the great religious questions which have agitated men's minds during the last fifty years, Dr. Perowne has thought fit to place what is called the Oxford Movement in the first place for consideration. Doubtless to the Bishop the matter seems to be of prime importance, but his pronounced public attitude towards the movement hardly qualifies him to give an unbiassed account of a man's opinions who was accustomed to take no public action whatever for or against the movement. The Bishop, however, claims Pritchard as a kindred spirit, and gives some extracts in support of his contention from his privately expressed convictions. We are not for a moment saying that the Bishop is guilty of the slightest breach of confidence in so doing, but there is all the difference in the world between divulging a man's private opinions and appealing to the significance of his formal public utterances and actions; and what we hold is that under the Bishop's treatment the Oxford Movement looms rather more largely into view than Pritchard himself would have desired. As the Bishop says, 'in controversies of this kind Pritchard took no open part. Naturally the greater part of his theological studies lay in a different direction' (p. 175). We see in the Bishop's account of the early years at Clapham that Pritchard's theological views, so far as he entered into party questions, were in harmony with those of his friend (p. 79), although no dated letter of Pritchard's is given on such subjects which can be compared with Dr. Perowne's account until some fifteen years have elapsed from that date. Then it is true we have his estimate of Newman and Pusey, their sacerdotal teaching, and the like (p. 172). But one great reason why he deplored the feverish controversies which raged round such great names is not a theological objection at all. They seemed, characteristically to him, to divert the university from its true object, 'the education of British youth' (p. 173), and he makes several remarks to show that he had not sought to gain any thorough acquaintance with Tractarian teaching in an esoteric way, that he viewed it from without, and was conscious of his want of familiarity with its atmosphere. After reading Mozley's *Reminiscences* he is left 'more decidedly an

Evangelical
the his
as the
Mr. F
and th
phenom
' My o
mould
phenom
mea cu
throwi
of this
ing the
scienti
were s
Pritcha
with re
miracle
material
the san
less str
and the
with a
facts (1
Pritcha
was pre
guarded
glad to
Professo
slownes
lecture,
British
was his
when w
' I had
the dog
for us to
whatever
between
me a ve
Divine r
not find
great Fa
acquisiti
to the ta

Evangelical . . . though softened and more sympathetic for the historical and corporate aspects of the Church of England as they bear on the "High Church" (p. 174). In thanking Mr. Ffoulkes 'for giving him more insight into Pusey's ways and thoughts,' he confesses that Pusey and Newman were phenomena not wholly within the grasp of his conceptions. 'My own mind and culture have been cast in very different moulds.' So again: 'Pusey to me has ever remained a phenomenon out of or beyond my sympathies or intelligence, *mea culpa* no doubt. So I feel indebted to you for your throwing more *couleur de rose* over the character and being of this remarkable man' (p. 175). The controversies respecting the character and limits of revelation and its relation to scientific discovery, the possibility of miracles, and the like, were subjects which had a more powerful attraction for Pritchard, and on which he spoke as a Christian apologist with remarkable weight. A passage upon the credibility of miracles and the relation of the Divine Will to the motions of material atoms (pp. 178-81) is too long for quotation, but at the same time too valuable to be passed by in silence. No less striking is the acute criticism of Darwinism (pp. 181-88), and the combination of profound reverence for Holy Scripture with a readiness to admit the full force of ascertained scientific facts (pp. 188-94). Again, 'towards the higher criticism Pritchard's attitude was anything but sympathetic. Still, he was prepared to make admissions,' and the details of this guarded position are very interesting (pp. 194-200). We are glad to see in two notes appended to the account of the Professor's theological work the splendid passage on the slowness of the creative process from his first Hulsean lecture, and the preface to the sermon delivered before the British Association at Nottingham in 1866 (pp. 201, 204). It was his way to let many a pregnant sentence fall from him when writing or speaking on solemn subjects. For example, 'I had almost rather doubt than be satisfied with and rest on the dogmata of Rome' (p. 175). And again, 'It is impossible for us to give the whole account of even any one single thing whatever' (p. 178); or again, 'If I found a compatibility between Genesis i. and our present knowledge, it would be to me a very serious difficulty in my accepting Genesis i. as a Divine revelation: and I mean this very seriously. For I do not find it to be the general method of procedure with the great Father to provide His children with anything for the acquisition of which He has endued them with faculties equal to the task' (p. 190). And it is a great satisfaction to us to

call attention to the letter on 'modern criticism' written to Professor Sanday:

'It occurs to me that this modern criticism raises far more difficulties than those which it endeavours to explain or to remove. The methods pursued do not seem to me to resemble those which have been hitherto successful in revealing some of the secrets of the natural world; to me they bear the aspect of haste and conjecture, but I believe my mind is *open*; I try to keep it so' (p. 196).

The significance and value of these remarks, and of many similar passages which might be quoted, are not fully realized unless we take into account the scientific accuracy of the mind of their author, and in order duly to appreciate this we must betake ourselves to the last aspect of Professor Pritchard's varied life, and look at him as a devout astronomer whose increasing knowledge of the vast works of nature only deepened his adoration of the Maker of them all.

V. It is no surprise to us to see mathematics and theology harmoniously assisting each other in the life of a great scholar, whether he engages in these two branches of study side by side, as was Pritchard's case, or whether he first becomes famous as a mathematician, and then, as it were, starting afresh, attains to equal celebrity as a theologian, as Dr. Salmon has done. Indeed, to us, mathematics appears to require theology as its complement. Fleeting glimpses of the immensity and mystery of things are continually breaking in, for those who have eyes to see, in the midst of abstruse mathematical formulas and processes, when they are least expected. There are unending lines, lines which meet, but meet only at a distance which is not measurable, quantities some greater and some less than any assignable magnitude, asymptotes, imaginary lines, lines and points at an infinite distance, space not only of the fourth, but of the fifth, sixth, and endlessly increasing dimensions,¹ such symbols as denote the square root of a negative quantity, and a great array of magnitudes and formulas which are at once an indication of the intricate vastness of created things and the limitation of the human intelligence which explores the edge of knowledge. When mathematical science is used, as Pritchard used it, as the handmaid of astronomical research, small in comparison with the illimit-

¹ This subject must always be connected with the name of the late Professor Cayley, who delivered a famous address on the subject before the British Association. The train of thought which it suggests to a religious mind is developed in Mr. Willink's *The World of the Unseen* (Macmillans).

able
power
which
astron
soul'
study
Every
p. 158

W
when
70' (p
establi
(p. 55
underg
theory
The d
of ast
Clapha
find in
Astron
fesses
formed
(p. 83)
fessor
astron
culty i
ard dic
to be
John I
descrip
graphic
inner c
sun on
racteris
work, p
and ca
also be
cords
paper
water
two sm
strume
to the

¹ On
i. 287.

able purposes for which it is employed, the steadying power of theological study is needed for the great subjects which are displayed before the mind of man. When the astronomer possesses 'the uprightness and goodness of soul' which was stamped upon all Pritchard's work, the study of the heavens naturally raises the mind to God. Every one that is of the truth heareth His voice.¹ (See p. 158.)

We must not take the aged astronomer too literally when he says, 'I began my astronomical work really at 70' (p. 160). In his early career as a schoolmaster he had established an observatory in connexion with his school (p. 55), which might be expected of a man who, as an undergraduate, could explain a knotty point in the lunar theory to the most distinguished man of the year (p. 42). The distance which he had already travelled along the path of astronomical science when the time came for leaving Clapham in 1862, must have been considerable, for we find in that year that he became secretary of the Royal Astronomical Society, and Miss Rosalind Pritchard confesses that all through his life the study of astronomy had formed one of the chief occupations of his leisure hours (p. 83). At the same time Professor Turner, who, as Professor Pritchard's successor, was fitly chosen to write the astronomical chapters of the *Memoirs*, has had much difficulty in describing exactly what astronomical work Pritchard did in those earlier years. What information there is to be found is contained chiefly in some letters to Sir John Herschel. The most important matter in them is a description of the first successful application of the photographic method to the representation of the chromosphere and inner corona, on the occasion of the total eclipse of the sun on July 18, 1860 (pp. 219-32). The episode is characteristic of the man. He undertook a definite piece of work, prosecuted it with industry and ingenious resource, and carried it to a successful issue. To this early period also belong one or two laborious contributions to the records of the Royal Astronomical Society, including the paper on the Star of Bethlehem (pp. 232-5). At Freshwater we hear of observations pursued with great zeal in two small observatories equipped with the astronomical instruments brought from Clapham. There were also visits to the meetings of the Royal Astronomical Society (p. 83),

¹ On Joy in its relation to the Intellect. See Liddon, *Avant Sermons*, i. 287.

and Professor Turner dates a new phase of astronomical activity from about the year 1860 (p. 232). It is also to be observed that he considers that Pritchard's most important work in the society belongs to the period between 1862 and 1868. It must suffice here to say that during these years Pritchard was occupied much with the astronomical controversy upon the 'willow-leaves,' as Nasmyth called them, on the surface of the sun, and with careful work in drawing up the reports of the society. Within this period fall the Nottingham sermon of 1866 (p. 90) and occasional astronomical observations in company with his illustrious neighbour Tennyson (p. 100). With the year 1870 comes Pritchard's official connexion as Savilian Professor of Astronomy with the University of Oxford. We must deny ourselves the pleasure of commenting upon some of the interesting names of the men who preceded Pritchard in the chair, to whom Miss Pritchard refers (p. 105), and must be contented by saying that Sir Henry Savile himself as a septuagenarian had delivered the first lecture on geometry upon the foundation of the two professorships which are named after him, and by quoting Wood's prophecy that Savile's name will be 'honourable not only among the learned but the righteous for ever, even till the general conflagration shall consume all books and learning' (*ibid.*). Pritchard's first great work was that he acted as a pioneer in practical astronomical work in the University, by the establishment, rapid development, and great success of the present University observatory (p. 261). A small impression of this building has been appropriately stamped upon the cover of the book, and in connexion with it we are glad to do our part in praising the skill, courtesy, and unremitting diligence of the Professor's assistants, Messrs. Plummer and Jenkins, and of the fidelity and capacity of his servant, Mr. John Mullis (pp. 270-3). By this new building the University of Oxford led the van in England for the foundation of an observatory for 'astronomical physics' (p. 265), a term which in Pritchard's view included work with the photographic camera, as well as with the spectro-scope (p. 266). It does not fall within our present purpose to describe in any detail the work achieved by Pritchard in his new observatory, nor, indeed, does Professor Turner undertake to do this. What it was in outline may be seen from the brief summary of research as shown in the annual reports made to the Board of Visitors (p. 279). Nor need we enlarge upon the view which Pritchard took of his

position
many c
way.
astrono
formati
graduat
cessful
both in
one ins
school
(p. 277)
sentativ
which a
of his
sharp l
help fr
first of
metria
made t
speciall
meter.
the pu
(pp. 28
from th
Society
tion (p
pletion
parallax
of Pritc
graphic
distance
to our e
so by in
do sens
round t
of twen
one sta
(pp. 30
and he
great u
This wa
graphic
had bee
from th
We

position as a teacher, except to notice that on this, as on so many other matters, he looked in a very large and generous way. It is sufficient to say that he lectured on mathematical astronomy for the final Honour Schools (p. 261), he gave information of a more advanced and complete character to graduates (p. 276), and he made many by no means unsuccessful attempts to popularize astronomy among young men both in the University and outside it. His city lectures were one instance of this (p. 128), and his lectures to elementary schoolmasters from Oxford and the neighbourhood another (p. 277). What we must do is to mention one or two representative pieces of work in which Pritchard was engaged, and which afforded him many opportunities for the display of two of his characteristic methods of working, aiming by short sharp bursts at definite results, and seeking every possible help from those who were best qualified to give it. The first of these achievements was the publication of the *Uranometria nova Oxoniensis* in 1886, one of the earliest attempts made to measure the brightness of the stars by an instrument specially designed for the purpose called the Wedge Photometer. The description of this instrument, and the range of the publication, are lucidly and untechnically described (pp. 286-98). The importance of the work may be inferred from the fact that the gold medal of the Royal Astronomical Society was awarded to Professor Pritchard upon its completion (pp. 141, 280). The second achievement was the completion of a great scheme for the determination of stellar parallax by photography (pp. 278, 300). Here the novelty of Pritchard's work consisted in the employment of the photographic method. The parallax of a star is the inverse of its distance. There are only a few stars which are near enough to our earth to make the determination of their parallax, and so by inference their distance, possible. Of those stars which do sensibly change their apparent position as the earth moves round the sun Pritchard determined the parallax in the case of twenty-nine stars, at a time when there were only ninety-one stars whose parallax had been measured with any care (pp. 300-4). His results were published in 1889 and 1892, and he then devoted himself to the furtherance of his third great undertaking, on which he had begun to work in 1887. This was the production of a complete international astrographic chart. When the Oxford share of this vast enterprise had been successfully begun, 'the master hand was withdrawn from the work' (p. 316).

We will not conclude by enumerating the instances on

which Pritchard's work did not produce the results for which he himself hoped, although on more than one occasion he was dissatisfied and baffled after arduous labour. Nor must we enumerate, as we should like to do, the honours which were showered upon him, including a highly cherished honorary fellowship from his old college. We prefer to place ourselves with those who have recognized the real greatness of the man, and if we must choose the words in which to end our survey they shall be taken, not from a respectful letter of Dr. Liddon's (p. 113), nor from the Sonnet of eulogy which Professor Sylvester, the distinguished mathematician in the other Savilian chair, addressed to Pritchard (p. 143), nor from the complimentary letter of the Pope's Secretary (p. 158), but from the eloquent homage of his parish priest, who knew that Pritchard found traces of the Divine wisdom in the infinitely small, as in the infinitely great :¹

'With hearts uplifted by his words, we would bid him a last farewell. Farewell, Charles Pritchard ! Skilful astronomer, humble Christian, tender friend, faithful witness to the truth. Dear, right dear to thee were the counsels of thy God. Through many a long day and far into the watches of the night, it was thy delight to count what might be counted of their mighty sum, to trace and treasure every token of the Almighty's hand. And now, we doubt not, death has been to thee the awaking to a nearer presence and a clearer vision of thy God in the heavens which are not seen but eternal' (p. 167).

ART. VIII.—BUSSELL'S 'SCHOOL OF PLATO.'

The School of Plato : its Origin, Development, and Revival under the Roman Empire. By F. W. BUSSELL, B.D., B. Mus., Fellow and Tutor of B.N.C., Oxford. (London, 1896.)

'I AM afraid,' Mr. Bussell writes in his Preface, 'that my title will appear something of a misnomer.' Indeed, it does so. The plan has clearly grown under the author's hand. Beginning with the intention of writing a history of speculation in the Roman Imperial age, he has ended by giving a *résumé* of all ancient philosophy from Thales to Proclus. Even now, apparently, the final shape of the work is not quite determined. In the Preface Mr. Bussell promises us a later volume, for which dates, analyses, contrasts, and personal details are reserved. Later on he hints at a series of

¹ A gas-jet suggested to him 'the infinity of minuteness' (p. 149).

volum
ledge
ment
essays
not a
repeti

Th
are 'b
he ge
who f
opinio
ledges
specu
stand
are pl
somev
the ex
statel
the fi
bring
relati
ing t
vivaci
lengen
from
moral
Every
his ov
the r
certai
pend
style
of the

It
and i
part
natio
lays
sensa
place
know
possi
bund
were
plex

volumes, in one of which the theoretical problem of knowledge is to be discussed. There are manifest signs of development in the book before us. It consists of a number of essays—and very excellent essays—but the several papers do not always fit very precisely, and there is somewhat more repetition than is necessary for the sake of due emphasis.

The first epithets that the reader will apply to the book are 'brilliant, scholarly, epigrammatic, and audacious.' Before he gets to the end he will find that he is listening to one who from the history of thought has gathered, not only clear opinions, but warm convictions. Mr. Bussell frankly acknowledges that 'he has examined the whole course of Greek speculation from start to finish, from a peculiar and restricted standpoint.' All historians do the same thing: when you are photographing a procession the camera must be planted somewhere. But Mr. Bussell calls upon his readers to observe the exact spot from which his view is taken. He surveys the stately march of Greek thought, not from the side, but from the front—in fact from, modern life. What he wants is to bring out the practical meaning of the old debates, their vital relation to the very same questions that we are still attempting to answer. Hence his pages are full of interest and vivacity. But hence also almost every sentence is a challenge. The dry problem of knowledge changes, like Proteus, from shape to shape, appearing now as theology, now as morality, now as politics, always with the same direct reality. Everywhere the author has a clear and trenchant opinion of his own, and from first to last his personality hovers before the reader's eyes. A book of which all this can be said is certainly a notable production, but its final value will depend not so much upon the fine scholarship or the brilliant style of the writer, as upon the coherence and reasonableness of the theory which underlies and animates his work.

It is difficult to understand precisely what that theory is, and it is to be regretted that Mr. Bussell did not devote a part at any rate of this, his first volume, to a definite explanation of what he means by Certainty. In one passage he lays it down as an axiom that we can only know our own sensations, not that which causes them. Throughout he places the strongest possible accent on the personality. We know the Self: this is the one thing we do know beyond possibility of doubt. The Self is to be regarded, not as a bundle of sensations, nor as a bundle of faculties, as if it were a set of pigeon-holes in a bureau, but as a living complex organic unity, of which every act involves the whole.

Personality in this sense is the supreme criterion of truth for man. 'There is no reality but consciousness of self, no ultimate test of a religion, or of a science, or even of an altruistic theory but the satisfaction felt by the personal spirit' (p. 69). Reason by itself is not the personality; hence by itself it can never attain to the highest certainty. Impersonal scientific research begins by dividing human nature, and 'remains to the end dualistic, unappropriated by the full mental and moral consciousness of the philosopher' (p. 151). Or we may say, it asks simply what things are, not why they are or what they matter to me. Hence when this cool analysis is directed to the supreme object of contemplation, to freedom and moral discipline, in which all objects of thought meet and sustain one another, it is foredoomed to failure.

Where, then, is certainty or 'comfortable assurance' (p. 87) to be found? 'It appears,' says Mr. Bussell, 'to be a fact well ascertained, and obvious to the student of "human thought engaged on the highest problems," that, unless begun with certain definite prejudice, this search ends in negation and despair' (p. 275). This 'prejudice,' this inherent, innate belief, which may be flouted with many scornful names—personal bias, ingrained preference, invincible preoccupation, mysticism—rests upon 'the intuitions of the moral sense,' the deepest and broadest fact of the personality. It is what we call Faith. From the edge of the precipice of scepticism to which the path of speculation leads, Faith takes its *salto mortale* across the gulf, venturing all upon the three great affirmations of God, freedom, and immortality. It is the voice of personality, but of a personality which has been roused by civilization to a feeling of its own dignity. When once this feeling is awakened 'it is ineradicable, except by a deliberate return to the woods and acorns of animalism' (p. 290). It is 'not a philosophical conclusion at all, but the intrusion of a religious conviction' (p. 115). Being the utterance of our personality, it forces upon us the belief in a Deity who is no mere world-soul, but a Person like ourselves.

'The name God will always waken the idea of a deliberate Creator, working for a purpose, producing, though gradually, His own image or reflexion in a world once utterly hostile and alien—"the spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters"—until the thwarting influence is overcome, "persuaded" by gentle means into obedience, and the spirit "now hath filled all the world"' (p. 309).

With the exception of the extremely peculiar view of Nature here hinted at, this is a position which has been held by great

men.
and of
crete
and n
by wh
like fo
nouris

A
builds
futile,
other
proof.
it is—

'So
two ter
posed
Mystic
the du
struggl
Knowl
its rela
side of
whole
wreste
system
Reason
is clea
finally
equabl
the du
sence

In
if we
man;
out of
power
that t
Natur
his rig
man a
this c
doing
his ov
Busse
a sees
as a s

men. It is, in the main, that of Kant, of Butler, of Pascal, and of St. Augustine. It relies upon the testimony of concrete human nature. It sets conscience above intelligence, and maintains consequently that truth for man is truth by which man can live; that truth, as St. Augustine said, is like food, and that its sufficient guarantee is the fact that it nourishes.

A favourite scoff against this mode of thought is that it builds religion upon scepticism. The scoff is absolutely futile, because all certainty is built upon scepticism, or, in other words, upon facts which are in no case susceptible of proof. But Mr. Bussell boldly accepts the challenge, such as it is—

'Socrates,' he says, 'like his disciple Plato, represents a union of two tendencies which are by no means so incompatible as is supposed; he was both a sceptic and a mystic' (p. 83). 'What is Mysticism? It is, to be brief, an attempt to solve by love and emotion the dualism of the world; and especially to reconcile the constant struggles and defiance of the individual with universal law. . . . Knowledge conducts, it may be, to absolute truth, but cannot show its relation to the acute and sensitive personality which lives alongside of the pure Nous, not touching it at all points. The man is the whole concrete being, and not a part supposed to be the highest and wrested from its environment; as if even this were possible. Any system which proposes as the highest Good the satisfaction of pure Reason (man's impersonal part, after all) in the region of pure ideas is clearly foredoomed to failure. . . . Reflection is absolutely and finally dualistic, and can by itself see no reconciliation. . . . Minds of equable balance, by a free and deliberate act of moral choice, solve the dualism. Love raises in them a new sense of the divine presence so long lost to philosophic introspection' (p. 296).

In fact, the general drift of the book may be stated thus, if we do not mistake: that certainty is an act of the whole man; that impersonal research, the study of facts considered out of relation to ourselves, leads to dualism, to the idea of a power outside ourselves, antagonistic to our free development; that this power clothes itself in abstractions, such as the State, Nature, Humanity, and calls upon the individual to forego his rightful claims for the benefit of these idle words; that man always has risen, and always will rise, in rebellion against this compulsory and useless self-effacement, and is right in so doing, because there is that within him which assures him of his own supreme value in the eyes of a personal Deity. Mr. Bussell, therefore, conceives the history of philosophy, not as a seesaw between subjective and objective points of view, but as a series of 'revolts of the individual' against partial truths,

which he feels, and therefore knows, to be inimical to his divinely appointed end of self-realization, or in other words as a gradual discovery of the supreme value to us of the life of self-consciousness.

This is a position which commands warm sympathy. Nevertheless, as it is here laid down, it leaves more than one serious difficulty unsolved.

It is by no means easy to understand what Mr. Bussell considers to be the exact relation between Reason and Faith. On this point his language is extremely vacillating. 'Socrates,' he writes in one place, 'arrives at the practical through the theoretical' (p. 63); but then, again, we read that 'so far as he uses Reason his results are negative' (p. 86), and that 'Reflection is absolutely dualistic.' Generally speaking, Mr. Bussell seems to regard Faith as the voice of the practical Reason. But what does this Kantian phrase mean? Is the practical Reason reasonable or not? Does Faith act in defiance of logic, and is its *salto mortale* a desperate guess? Or is its protest directed against a partial logic, a logic which refuses to look at the whole of the facts? Is it Love without Reason, or is it Love with Reason, and in this case how does it differ from any other mode of applied Reason, which, if it is to do any good, must always love its object, even if that object be as dry as the Rule of Three?

We are not sure how Mr. Bussell would answer these questions, but a clear answer is of great importance. Kantism, which tends to separate Love from Reason, may be so applied as to deny any religious value to Knowledge, or, in other words, to dogma. Hegelianism, which regards man as an organic whole, may be so applied as to deny the personality of God and all supernaturalism. Mr. Bussell holds a decided and very peculiar view of the personality of God. But we do not understand what religious value he would leave to Natural Science, which Augustine found so helpful, or whether he regards metaphysics as mere divination. But, if Reason enters into the act of Faith, then his stalwart Individualism is surely very difficult to maintain in its integrity. For Reason is general and impersonal, and, so far as it plays a part, Faith must be common and sociable. Now Mr. Bussell pushes Individualism so far as to hold that all men are by nature wholly selfish. Religion comes in and forms some kind of bond of union. But then he makes Religion itself self-regarding, so that this new form of Social Contract is wholly without sanction. Mr. Kidd held much the same view of human nature, but, at any rate, he looked upon reli-

gion
thoug
M
respe
mode
Chris
wron
selfish
where
vated
peopl
prete
W
the d
tions,
nonse
H
abstr
Refor
from
serio
part
that
foreg
exist
furth
'
most
in the
(p. 74
It re
valu
sell's
thoro
'
will
impu
ends,
the b
is the
of all
subje
7
is d

gion as enforced self-sacrifice, and so invested it with real, though only legal, power.

Mr. Bussell's attitude on this point—we must say it with all respect—is most peculiar. He is very angry with certain moderns who masquerade in Christian dress. If they are not Christians, he thinks, they ought to be selfish, and it is very wrong of them to pretend to be otherwise. 'With a frank selfishness Christianity can deal; but it is almost powerless wherever Pantheistic fervour or Cosmic Emotion has enervated the mind into forgetfulness of itself' (p. 72). Such people cannot really be disinterested, and they ought not to pretend that they are.

Well, then, what is Mr Bussell? He is an Individualist of the deepest dye, and a Utilitarian, the sworn foe of all abstractions, sentimentalisms, and high-flown phrases, and a *a priori* nonsense of every kind.

He insists, with justice, on the utter breakdown of the abstract ideas which were so popular at the time of the Reform Bill. Sixty years ago liberty, in the sense of freedom from control, was to be the panacea for all ills, and now, serious men are discussing the advisability of putting a tenth part of our people under permanent coercion. He maintains that men will not submit to become wheels in a machine nor forego their legitimate claims for the sake of a society which exists only for their advantage and by their consent. Yet further:

'The Gospel of Christ, historically the mightiest instrument, the most powerful factor in the development of modern Europe, depends in the last resort upon the overthrow of the fallacy of Collectivism' (p. 74).

It rests, in fact, on the divine recognition of the transcendent value of the individual. This, as we have seen, is Mr. Bussell's master thought, and he applies it with unshrinking thoroughness to every department of thought and activity.

'The individual, moved instinctively to follow his restless impulse, will "work out his own salvation," not only desiring to commit with impunity vulgar acts of petty larceny, but to attain that noblest of ends, self-realization. From this impulse proceed the noblest and the basest acts in human history. Love of self, knowledge of self, as it is the cause of all misery and failure, is also in its true sense the source of all good. We have to correct, not to inhibit or annihilate, the subjective spirit' (p. 68).

There is a youthful vehemence about this outbreak which is delightful, and Mr. Bussell ought to be a most popular

college tutor. At the same time it cannot be said of him, as was said of Mill's *Liberty*, that he is calling 'Fire! Fire!' in Noah's flood. Socialism and Pantheism are real and pressing dangers, and anybody who pleads the cause of the down-trodden individual with vigour and conviction is rendering public service. But, after all, one who takes a calm and philosophic view of the situation might suggest that Socialism and Individualism are no more mutually exclusive than Reason and Faith. As Sir Roger de Coverley used to maintain, 'there is much to be said on both sides.'

So far as Collectivism builds upon abstract human nature—that is to say, upon human nature regarded as equal—it is in absolute contradiction to permanent facts. As a system it could only be realized by force, the force of the majority and the inferior. From the nature of things it must level down to the average, destroying all eminence and sterilizing all the seeds of progress. Mr. Bussell may be as hard upon it as he pleases; here all sensible men will be with him. Nevertheless, Collectivism, like all other opinions that have been held by honest men, has a certain basis in reality. It answers to two patent facts in that concrete human nature to which Mr. Bussell makes his constant appeal. If men were equal, they could no more combine than so many grains of sand. But they are unequal, and it is precisely this inequality which drives them into society for the supply of their mutual needs. And, secondly, there are in concrete human nature—surely Mr. Bussell will not deny this?—unselfish instincts, impulses to give; and these bind society together, making men not only able but willing to supply these mutual needs. There is truth in Individualism; it rests upon the fact of superiority, and upon the fact that no man can be happy for another. There is truth also in Collectivism; it rests upon the fact that it is more blessed to give than to receive. But if either of these two sides of human nature attempts to suppress the other, it becomes at once the most pernicious of untruths. As a system, Collectivism affirms that it is more blessed to take than to receive, and as a system Individualism denies the brotherly league.

But Mr. Bussell carries Individualism to such a pitch that he leaves hardly any room for unselfishness—that is to say, for happiness. For we hold it to be a truth beyond dispute that a man is happy in proportion as he is unselfish. What Mr. Bussell maintains, unless we sadly mistake him, is that no man can be disinterested unless he is religious, and this is surely an error—unless we are prepared to say that religion

and
men
woul
be th
No c
only
surel
if it
with
V
the
of vi
hum
cont
new
'the
of th
but
ther
us t
altru
alms
garr
but
Mr.
pers
that
noth
a ju
he v
altru
is an
as w
bein
spiri
sure
us t
mak
It
Hon
Gos
and
mor
the
very

and disinterestedness are the same thing, and in this case all men are by nature religious. This, however, Mr. Bussell would by no means allow. His case throughout appears to be that reasoned morality is a different thing from religion. No doubt it is not the same; but do they differ in kind, or only as lower and higher in the same kind? The latter surely; yet the former appears to be Mr. Bussell's view, and, if it is so really, he leaves human nature at hopeless strife with itself.

We should say, for instance, that the Atonement altered the whole of morality by affixing divine sanction to the law of vicarious suffering, though that law had existed ever since human nature was first created. Mr. Bussell seems, on the contrary, to assert that the Atonement introduced an entirely new principle of action. It does not appear to us to be true that 'the unselfish temper cannot survive apart from the assurances of the Christian religion' (p. 69). It would not be so common, but it would still survive. Some men would still forgive, and there would still be mothers. Nor, again, does it appear to us to be quite fair to speak of philosophers who preach altruism apart from Christianity as 'living upon the charitable alms of previous centuries, and clothing themselves in stolen garments' (p. 80). There is some truth in this sharp saying, but it is not wholly true. The philosophers might retort that Mr. Bussell is attacking, not philosophy, but that very human personality whose claims he sets so high. Or they might say that he need not excite himself, because his own doctrine is nothing but another form of selfishness. And this would be a just retort, for Mr. Bussell is a Utilitarian. '*Noblesse oblige*,' he writes, 'the undefinable sense of duty, is by no means an altruistic principle, but is, in the last resort entirely selfish. It is an idle misuse of language to describe the devotion of love as wholly unselfish; its sacrifices being warranted, its desires being in the highest degree recommended to the personal spirit as the truest consummation of self' (p. 71). But this is surely Thrasymachus or Hobbes in a modern dress; it leads us to ask how Christianity, if this is all it has to teach, would make the misguided altruistic philosopher any better than he is. It might even be said that what Mr. Bussell preaches is Honour, or Chivalry, or artistic self-assertion, but not the Gospel. The voice of human nature always has protested and always will protest against any system which reduces morality to calculation, however cultivated and enlightened the calculation may be. Utilitarianism is nothing but that very logic against which Mr. Bussell so vigorously protests.

Even morality must be unselfish, and as for faith its object is not ourselves at all, but a Being infinitely higher and wiser, who makes us better, and towards whom our proper attitude is certainly not that of self-assertion in any shape or form.

Indeed, Mr. Bussell can himself give admirable expression to thoughts which seem to rise above his general plane of thought.

'In any true religious feeling,' he says, 'there are two stages, the finding and the losing of self; the consciousness of particular individual life, in the sense, not indeed of complete freedom, but of entire dependence which ensues. There are two indispensable steps in the process: religious feeling must be self-conscious and at the same time resigned; it must be a freely chosen submission of the strong selfish impulse to a general law, of the single to the universal will' (p. 220).

Not a word of this statement should we wish to alter, but it is not in the same key with many other passages which might be quoted.

It may be thought without ill-nature that Mr. Bussell's views on life at large would be better for maturing in the light of a fuller experience. There are a host of opinions flung out almost at random in this book which strike one as what used to be called 'flashy'—very vigorous, very sparkling, but not quite true. Take this passage: 'From the multitude of the early manlike animals described in the first chapter of Genesis—living like their fellows by guidance of instinctive and unconscious impulse—Adam is selected' (p. 199). Mr. Bussell gives few notes or references, and allows no means of guessing from what source he has derived this piece of information, which, if true, is certainly a remarkable contribution to the stock of knowledge. There was a book published some time ago (the author's name has unfortunately escaped our memory; it was a stately octavo written in a queer kind of rhapsody, more blank verse than prose) in which it was maintained that Adam was the missing link. Mr. Bussell, who is a fine scholar, can hardly have condescended to draw his water with such a cranky wheel as this. But then, where on earth did he pick up so naïve a piece of exegesis? If this is one of the revelations of his practical Reason, that faculty must have stolen its name.

Perhaps this is the best place for directing attention to a couple of passages which should be altered in a future edition. It was Plutarch, not Aristotle (p. 108), who gave the Ideas a local habitation. Aristotle held that the place of Form was

the I
might
Plotin
seems
are o
great
ences
Xenon
mean
is att
been
Vache
in qu
would
Bu
of opi
variou
Utilita
endea
ment
an imp
dashed
trained
which
of the
W
unselfi
reflexi
desire
in a c
that T
in mod
not beg
the fir
then it
in the
was no
moralit
or man
to the
longer
could
whole
despoti
individ

the Intelligence. And Numenius (p. 341) to a hasty reader might appear to be reckoned among the successors of Plotinus. Mr. Bussell has a *penchant* for Numenius, and seems to think (p. 212) that he is unjustly neglected. There are only a few lines to neglect, and these are really of no great consequence. It would have been well to give references for what is said about Philip of Opus (p. 145) and Xenocrates (p. 124). If the latter really taught that the meaning of a series of changes can only be read when the end is attained, he anticipated a view of which a good deal has been heard in modern times, and which is certainly not Vacherot's invention. But we have failed to find the passage in question, and this is eminently a case where a footnote would have been serviceable.

But we have been dwelling perhaps too long on differences of opinion. It will be no news to the reader that there are various conceptions of faith, and that all men are not Utilitarians. Let us pass on to a more grateful task, and endeavour to describe Mr. Bussell's conception of the movement of Greek thought. What he has given may be called an impressionist sketch in black and white. The picture is dashed upon the paper in a few bold strokes, and only a trained eye can detect the nicety and fullness of the scholarship which underlies, for instance, the short but brilliant estimate of the Imperial literature and of Cæsarism as a practical idea.

While not flatly denying that philosophy arose out of unselfish wonder, Mr. Bussell insists that the stimulus to reflexion was practical need—that is to say, the conscious desire for greater freedom and greater comfort. Here he is in a certain qualified antagonism to Aristotle, who records that Thales used his knowledge to effect what we should call in modern slang 'a corner in olives,' but maintains that he did not begin his researches with that object in view. However, the first philosophy—the Ionic—was natural science, built, as then it could only be built, on audacious guesses. It ended in the first breakdown, in materialism or pantheism. There was no certainty, and the old religious civic morality, the morality of little communities, at constant war with nature or man, in which each individual was in life-long subjection to the drill-sergeant, was shaken to its base. Men would no longer be wheels in a machine, or submit to laws which they could not understand. It is a valuable thought that the whole course of purely Greek philosophy was affected by the despotism of the old Greek States. The first revolt of the individual took the shape of Sophistry. The Sophist had

been taught that the world was made by intelligence, and he twisted this, in the spirit of *l'homme sensuel moyen*, into meaning that it is made by *my* intelligence. His philosophy, in fact, was that of Ancient Pistol, 'The world is mine oyster.'

Against these arose Socrates. What this admirable man maintained was that the world is not only made but governed by intelligence; that the intelligence is not mine, nor yours, but like that of our common human nature; that it is not bare intelligence, but intelligence which is good, and good to man; that God is a Father, taking note of the individual like a tender personal Friend. Mr. Bussell brings out with great skill this truly religious side of Socrates, leading to a 'tender interest in others,' 'in Alcibiades, not in human nature in the abstract' (p. 91). The weak point in the Socratic teaching was a hasty optimism (p. 93). He saw in Nature nothing but human and benevolent design, and in natural man nothing but wisdom and goodness. Man was spoiled by prejudice and conventionality, but only needed to be reminded of himself. 'To know the right was to do it.' Yet the Socratic 'appeal was in the main a true one, to man's own dignity, to our trust in him—in a word, to his honour' (p. 93).

Socrates had already set the moral final cause above the efficient, the physical. Plato developed this line of thought. The truth of things, as he taught, lies in their meaning; they exist, when they are what God meant them to be. The universe is the realization of a Divine purpose (p. 102). Thus Plato's work was to develop and consolidate the simple teleology of Socrates. In this manner the general conception that we arrive at by reasoning becomes the thought that was in God's mind when He created the thing; the purpose is the Idea, and this is the cause. The basal thought of Plato is 'final purpose, ethical motive, by which he transformed the frigid search for causation into a moral and enthusiastic cult of goodness' (p. 106). 'This'—we have already quoted the words—'is not a philosophic conclusion at all, but the intrusion of a religious conviction. This is Plato's permanent contribution to the development of thought' (p. 115).

Plato, however, could not keep a firm grasp of the Socratic belief in the personality of God. The goodness of which he thinks is, sometimes at least, impersonal, taking no note of the individual, devoid of will, above existence, to us unintelligible. Hence he is only half-religious; for religion, in the words of Mr. Romanes, 'means a theory of Personal Agency in the universe, belief in which is strong enough in any degree to influence conduct' (p. 117). Goodness, without

will or
nor su

Ag
Aristo
as coe
Progre
sighs,
(p. 12
studen
affinity
(p. 13
Natur
or eve
of his
necess
with p

On
What
happi
leisure
tance
worsh
(p. 13

W
two to
Aristo
warho
of Per
Aristo
kinds
Emot
a mor
writin

W
stotle
sketch
points
level v
150);
unexp
enterp
is see
is now
outsid
quillit
vor

will or special providence, can neither account for the world nor supply a satisfactory rule of conduct.

Against this impersonality Aristotelianism is a protest. Aristotle is science incarnate. His object is Nature regarded as coeternal with God; his watchwords are Development and Progress. It is Nature that, 'in his otherwise prosaic pages, sighs, yearns and aspires after a pattern in the heavens' (p. 127). But 'knowledge is possible only to the accurate student and investigator,' hence 'to interest in man and his affinity to the Divine Nature succeeds physical research' (p. 133). In morals happiness becomes 'conformity to Nature.' The sage is no longer a missionary, like Socrates, or even Plato, but a student, a cosmopolitan, proudly 'conscious of his superiority to the vulgar herd' (p. 134). 'God is a necessary postulate for science, but has little or no connexion with practical life' (136).

One main question of Aristotelianism, therefore, will be, What is the relation of Nature to the single life? The highest happiness is that of the student, but for this end abundant leisure and abundant means are requisite. Hence the importance of Fortune, which quickly becomes a new deity, on whose worship Mr. Bussell has some very excellent remarks (p. 137).

We could wish that Mr. Bussell had devoted a page or two to a subject that he has barely glanced at, the fate of Aristotelianism in the later mediæval Schools. It was the warhorse of Aquinas and Scotus in their crusade on behalf of Personality; yet it was the source of Averroistic Pantheism. Aristotelianism led by two different roads to two different kinds of Pantheism. His apotheosis of Nature issued in Cosmic Emotion, but one passage of a few lines in the *De Anima* was a more powerful cause of spiritualistic Pantheism than all the writings of the Neoplatonists.

We must not dwell on the disciples of Plato and Aristotle. Their dull and intricate history hardly lends itself to sketchy treatment, yet hardly deserves more. Mr. Russell points out how the worship of Nature soon reduces man to a level with the brutes, or even sets him below them (pp. 148, 150); how, as soon as the first enthusiasm—'when the yet unexplored fields of genial Nature smilingly invited the enterprise of the student (p. 151)'—dies away, physical law is seen not as a queen but as a tyrant. Hence the 'wise man is now his own world; he neither knows nor desires anything outside himself' (p. 153). Happiness is conceived as Tranquillity, and this takes two shapes, Indian asceticism on the

one hand, Hedonism on the other. Mr. Bussell gives here some instructive observations on the curious attraction of the idea of death for the voluptuary, and an amusing note on the practical inconsistencies of Pessimists (p. 167).

The last division of the book opens with an account of Philo of Alexandria. Mr. Bussell thinks 'there can be no question that Philo is the link between earlier Platonic philosophy and the dogmatic and religious Platonism which revives under the Roman Empire' (p. 204). This opinion is certainly too strongly expressed. Philo may have been known to Numenius, who was possibly a Jew, but otherwise no historical connexion whatever can be traced between him and Plotinus, nor does the latter contain one single idea which can with any confidence be regarded as a debt to Philo. The chief merit of this chapter is an excellent sketch of the distinguishing features of Hebraism: its belief in a God who 'takes trouble'; its view of man as 'the free and indispensable agent of God's loving decrees' (p. 202); the success with which it reconciled the claims of the individual with those of the society. 'The temper of wholesome European society,' we read, 'is begotten of the union of Roman and Jewish ideals' (p. 197). Philo emphasized the transcendence of the Divine Spirit, accepted the immanence under certain reservations, and enunciated 'the great principle of Mediating Natures between the Highest and the lowest' (p. 206).

From this we pass to the revival of Platonism. The leading question is, once again, not, What is my relation to Nature? but What is my relation to the Divine? 'For fifteen centuries this will be the prevailing and absorbing study.' Revived Platonism, allying itself with unhellenic elements in Judaism or Christianity, boldly seeks new regions of freedom in communion with the divine Ideas. The leading thoughts are the transcendence of God, the immortality of the soul, the imperfection of all revelations, the value of all religion. 'Barriers are broken down, limits are removed in a tolerant eclecticism that sees the finger of God in history, and His spirit working in the aspirations of heathen philosophers.' We know of God His Word—what he has chosen to reveal. 'The abyss, and, in the end, incognoscibility of God is a fundamental doctrine in Platonism' (p. 283).

The line of development runs on through the Platonising Stoics, who brought back into the schools the spirit of religion, but attempted to ally it with the worship of physical law. How they failed is well known. Mr. Bussell makes the just and striking remark that

bitten
of the
of P
his p
rather
from
beca

J
dual
guid
thou
an a
ideas
them
' doe
subst
Conc
Alm
Cont
betw
of th
order
' by
unite
matte
Deity
estran
solve
is no
separ
Busse
golde
his ov

M
Plotin
High
Ideal
centre
Platon
depend
again
In
Mr. B
satisf

'The finest defence of the concrete and visible world against the bitter attacks of the Gnostics proceeds by no means from the school of these professional eulogists of Nature, but from the inmost depths of Platonic mysticism. It is Plotinus and not Aurelius who raises his protest against the blasphemers of creation; and it is Plotinus rather than Seneca who reconciles men to this life, and dissuades from suicide—giving this life a peculiar and eternal value just because it is not the only and final existence of man' (p. 295).

Plotinus himself 'despaired of pure science as leading to dualism, and arouses a new faculty, the emotion of Faith guided by Love' (p. 322). 'Thus in the end every system of thought creeps back, with more or less shamefacedness, to an alliance with religion' (p. 323). What were the leading ideas of this greatest of ancient thinkers? Mr. Bussell finds them in Emanation, Continuity, and Relativity. Emanation 'does not posit an artificer (with his design) and a material substrate more or less intractable. Nature, the Visible Concrete Universe, is pronounced to be the body of the Almighty, the incarnation of His inmost thoughts' (p. 326). Continuity teaches us that 'there is no abyss stretching between Creator and created; rather a perennial outflowing of the fulness of Divinity' (p. 327). There must be an orderly descent from the top of all things to the bottom; 'by almost insensible gradations, the ladder of Jacob, we unite earth and heaven, and connect the lowest forms of matter, the first rudiments of life, with the inmost essence of Deity' (p. 327). Thus 'the problem of alienation, of estrangement, from the secret Mover of the Universe was solved. . . . How can man become anew reunited to God? is now an unmeaning question; they have never been separated' (p. 328). By Relativity we understand Mr. Bussell to mean that in this vast hierarchy, this descending golden chain of life, each man has his own place, his work, his own offer of happiness.

Mr. Bussell points out—we think, with justice—that the Plotinian scheme secures a kind of personality for the Highest. The Neoplatonist did not teach, like some modern Idealists, that 'God becomes conscious first in us as separate centres of consciousness' (p. 329). 'These successors of the Platonic Ideas do live in a veritable world apart, and independent' (p. 331). Nor is Matter scorned or denied, nor again is it identified with thought.

In its doctrines of Emanation and Relativity, in especial, Mr. Bussell judges that Neoplatonism did provide a fairly satisfactory explanation of the world. In these 'lay the

supreme and lasting merit of this great rival of Christianity. Absolute though the object of its search, Platonism acknowledged the development, the manifestation, of this Absolute (the Negative) in and by, and possibly for, the concrete and actual and relative. Nothing is hostile in a Universe which is one, which issues from the One, only to return to it again' (p. 342). Yet it leaves 'a physical necessity operating in the world rather than an intelligent counsel. There is a certain weakness in the appeal to emotion and love, on behalf of a Divinity which, after all, shows no interest in individual life, takes no thought for the struggles of the soul, and indeed cannot be said to be conscious of them' (p. 344). 'The question is really, from a practical point of view, unsolved' (345). What is needed is 'a Divine voice of consolation; something to assure the soul of man of its intrinsic worth, of its value in its Maker's eyes' (p. 345). It is in the semi-dualistic conception of the efforts, the painful efforts, of Deity that we are to find the significance of the Christian religion (p. 345).

Mr. Bussell might have devoted a page or two to the sudden and absolute breakdown of Neoplatonism. What fascination, what real help, lay in it we see very clearly in the *Confessions* of St. Augustine. Yet the glorious fabric reared by the devout mind of Plotinus—it is to him alone that the foregoing account can with justice be applied—vanished like a dream. In Porphyry, Iamblichus, Proclus, we find but scattered rays of the master's light, blended with the vilest and most abject superstition. The main reason is not far to seek, and Mr. Bussell is here in complete agreement with all who have looked with clear eyes on this death struggle of the Greek intellect. From first to last on Greek lips Love meant Desire. To the Greek mind in any age crucified Love would have seemed a contradiction in terms, ridiculous and base. The very thought was an insult to human dignity, and the notion that one man could be made better by the suffering of another seemed childish, preposterous, immoral. Yet it was upon this fact, this revolting fact, this 'stumbling block,' this 'folly,' that Christianity seized, and in this she found the law of the spiritual life. It is here, if we are not mistaken, that Mr. Bussell's vision is uncertain. He sees 'trouble' in heaven more clearly than on earth, and his ethical ideal seems to us still to bear more affinity than it should to the 'magnanimity' of Peripateticism. He is not a Humanitarian, but he is a little of a Humanist.

upon
jump
Inde
goes
chap
have
anta
sym
be c
but l
utter
is al
it se
relig
Pasc
trac

A

1. R

2. W

3. P

4. T

5. R

IN t
year

fin
of al
for tr
num
a ver
statist

But the book is certainly a remarkable one. It grows upon the reader, who will find himself far less inclined to jump up and protest at the end than he was at the beginning. Indeed, both style and thought seem to mature as the book goes on. One might hazard a guess that some of the earlier chapters are a good deal older in date than the later. If we have dwelt upon divergencies of opinion, it was because these antagonisms in detail were sharpened by considerable sympathy in the general line of thought. Mr. Bussell may be considered to have exaggerated the doctrine of personality, but he has given vigorous expression to a cardinal truth, and uttered a strenuous warning against a sentimentalism which is all the more dangerous because it looks so amiable. And it seems probable that the final reconciliation of science and religion will be found, as it was found by Augustine and by Pascal, not very far, to the right or to the left, from the line traced in this instructive history of Greek thought.

ART. IX.—JUVENILE CRIME, AND EFFORTS TO DIMINISH THE AMOUNT.

1. *Report of the Departmental Committee on the Education and Moral Instruction of Prisoners in Local and Convict Prisons.* (London, 1896.)
2. *War with Crime: Papers on Crime, Reformatories, &c.* By T. BARWICK LL. BAKER. (London, 1889.)
3. *Punishment and Prevention of Crime.* By Colonel Sir EDMUND DU CANE, K.C.B. (London, 1885.)
4. *Thirty-ninth Report of the Reformatory and Industrial Schools of Great Britain, for the Year 1895.* (London, 1896.)
5. *Report of the Departmental Committee on Reformatory and Industrial Schools.* (London, 1896.)

IN the Introduction to the *Criminal Statistics* published this year there is the following startling statement:

'The increase in the proportion of juvenile criminals is not confined to England, but appears to show itself in the judicial statistics of all other countries. In France the small number of minors sent for trial at the assizes shows a slight diminution, but the far larger numbers dealt with by the correctional tribunals go on increasing at a very rapid rate. The following figures, taken from the French statistics for 1892, show this very clearly:

		1880	1888	1889	1890	1891	1892
Males	Under 16	6577	7258	7603	7368	7272	7777
	Between 16 and 21	24757	26224	27873	27925	29576	32430
Females	Under 16	1110	1210	1283	1297	1231	1314
	Between 16 and 21	3435	3096	3307	3427	3001	3796

In Germany it appears that between 1888 and 1893, while the total number of persons convicted has increased by 20 per cent., the number of minors convicted has increased by 32 per cent., having risen from 33,069 to 43,742.

'The editor of the French statistics, in quoting these figures, remarks: "Tous les grands états civilisés de l'Europe, à l'exception de l'Angleterre, ont à déplorer le même accroissement de la criminalité des mineurs de 21 ans." I fear that this exception in favour of England has been given under a false impression derived from the English prison returns. Though the juvenile population of the English prisons has decreased, the results now obtained from the tables giving the number of persons tried at the assizes and quarter sessions and in courts of summary jurisdiction unfortunately show that this does not imply any real diminution in the amount of youthful criminality' (p. 20).

The following table, taken from the same authority, proves the point just asserted; it deals with children under sixteen:

	1864-68	1869-73	1874-78	1879-83	1884-88	1889-93	1894
Sentenced to imprisonment	8285	8266	6155	4557	3659	2698	1913
Sentenced to detention in Reformatory school	1228	1336	1382	1333	1245	1161	1790
Sentenced to be detained in Industrial school	966	1021	2234	3328	5095	6737	6815
Sentenced to be whipped	585	839	1225	2723	3152	3208	3192
Total	11064	12362	10996	11941	13151	13804	13710

To this may be added the following paragraphs:

'I noticed last year that the proportion of criminals between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one was higher than at any other age, and that from that point the proportion declined as life advanced. This year we find the proportion between sixteen and twenty-one markedly higher than in 1893, while the diminution of the proportion as life advanced is more rapid than before.'¹

In the official Report of the preceding year it is stated:

'If the proportion of crimes committed by women is small, the proportion committed by children and youths is enormously great.

¹ *Criminal Statistics*, 1894, p. 20. It ought to be added that these figures 'do not include the numbers punished by fine and the numbers, increasing in later years, who are discharged under section 16 of the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1879, or dealt with under the First Offenders Act.' On the other hand, many children have been sent to Industrial Schools under the Elementary Education Acts.

It will be found that of 43,835 persons convicted, 17,902, or 41 per cent., were under twenty-one years of age, and of 30,902 convicted of larceny, 14,064, or 45 per cent., were under that age.¹

It may be interesting to compare the proportion of juvenile offenders in the different classes of crime, as shown in the statistics of 1893 and 1894 respectively. The next noteworthy features in 1894, as in 1893, are that one-fourth of the persons convicted of simple larceny are children under sixteen, and that more than one-third of convicted burglars are youths between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one.²

These statements have been quoted at such length because of the absolute contradiction they give to beliefs which are generally held, and which have been industriously advocated by persons in authority. The notion is currently entertained that the two chief causes of crime in this country are poverty and ignorance, and that with the diminution of these causes crime has steadily and rapidly decreased. We fear that these beliefs are proved by the official figures and statements to be erroneous. That poverty is much diminished among us has been conclusively shown by the masterly tables concerning wages and the price of the necessities of life put forth by Sir Robert Giffen; that elementary education has been much more attended to by England, as well as by France and Germany, during recent years, must be evident to everyone. That all the children of the labouring classes are not thoroughly educated is certain; but of what class of the community can it be truthfully asserted that all the children belonging to it are well educated? English people are not naturally a book-loving race, so that it is not to be expected that the great mass of the people belonging to any class will be thoroughly well instructed if judged by a fairly high standard. But it is to be hoped that when children, to whatever class they may belong, have attended school, they will at all events have learned such elementary principles of morality as will preserve them from the commission of those grosser offences which bring them under the lash of the criminal law. Instead of this we find in this country that at the close of a quarter of a century, during which by law all children have been compelled to attend school, and when most, if not all of them, have attended school more or less before they are sixteen years of age, the amount of juvenile crime is rapidly increasing. Explain it as we may, the fact remains: the education given has not diminished crime, as we have all along been assured that it would do; and alike in

¹ *Criminal Statistics*, 1893, p. 86.

² *Ibid.* 1894, pp. 21-2.

England, France, and Germany it seems powerless to effect the object which its advocates have assured us that it would accomplish, although money and labour have been unstintedly bestowed upon it.

Under these circumstances we proceed to examine some statements that we possess concerning the generation of juvenile crime, and the organizations that have been set on foot to eradicate, or at all events to diminish, it.

We turn first of all to the state of things before the time when crime and vice were fairly grappled with. Concerning this Sir E. Du Cane thus writes in his book on the *Punishment and Prevention of Crime* :

‘Those who were concerned in dealing with crime in the early part of this century commonly remarked on the dimensions which juvenile criminality was attaining to. Statistics supported their opinions.

‘The only preventive measures were the Apprenticeship Laws of the time of Henry VIII, under which children between five and thirteen found begging or idle were compulsorily bound apprentice to some handicraft.

‘The training in vice was systematic ; young people were employed for the double reason that they could operate in many positions in which adults would find less facility ; and, further, the penalty of capital punishment would not usually be inflicted on detection. Boys of twelve, fourteen, and sixteen were, however, sometimes hanged ; and a child, named Leary—who commenced at the age of eight by stealing apples, and progressing through thefts of tarts and loaves, robberies of tills, and of trunks &c. from carts, and burglary, at length becoming the head of a gang—was at the age of thirteen sentenced to be hanged, but eventually got off with transportation for life. There were said to be in London two hundred flash houses frequented by six thousand boys and girls who had no employment or means of livelihood but by thieving.

‘In 1816, when the population of London was under a million and a half, there were in London prisons above 3,000 inmates under twenty years of age—half of these were under seventeen, some were nine or ten, and 1,000 of these children were convicted of felony.’¹

When there was evidently little or no trouble taken or effort made to reform these guilty children, it was only to be expected that they would become more and more criminal as life advanced : the trifling offences for which they were arraigned, such as stealing apples or tarts or a loaf of bread, would bring on them imprisonment for only short terms, so that in many instances the same child would be sentenced more than once during the same year. It would

¹ *Punishment and Prevention of Crime*, p. 200.

there
soner
chara
a wa
the
the
now
earli
comm
for i
judg
juven
set fo
ing ;
of th

young
or tw
into v
meet
said
occas
it cou
of H
reclai
any
itself
child
(Cap
beca
subje
taking

goug
that,
older
quic
later
enter
voler
who
goug
with
itself

therefore be only misleading to compare the number of prisoners convicted then and now: for offences of the minor character just named would probably now be dismissed with a warning from the presiding magistrate, and, consequently the sufferers for such wrong-doings would cease to bring the offenders into court. Such offences would therefore now not appear in the statistical report, whereas at the earlier period they would. As it is the amount of crime committed and not the amount of punishment meted out for it by which the moral condition of a nation has to be judged, it is obvious that a comparison of the state of juvenile morals at the earlier part of the century with that set forth in the earlier part of this article would be misleading; but enough has been said to show that the present state of things cannot be looked upon as satisfactory.

‘Nearly a hundred years ago a school for the reclamation of young criminals was attempted to be founded in London, and one or two similar institutions were afterwards started, but, from causes into which it is not necessary to enter, they failed. Speaking at a meeting in Gloucester five and thirty years ago, Mr. Barwick Baker said that the “seeing of children in prison, time after time, had occasioned him great pain, and he had thought much as to whether it could not be remedied. One day the Hon. Miss Murray, Maid of Honour to the Queen, called his attention to the possibility of reclaiming vicious children, and said that if he could bring to her any child that had sufficient strength of character to distinguish itself in vice, she had no fear that she should be able to make that child distinguish itself in virtue. She urged him to visit a school (Captain Brenton’s) then established in London; he did so, and became warmly interested in it. He talked to his friends on the subject of founding a similar institution, but few had the means of taking it up and paying sufficient attention to it.”¹

After a time, Mr. Baker says:

‘To my astonishment the young squire, George Henry Bengough, who was heir to a fortune of 10,000*l.* a year, declared that, in spite of his youth, he would like to undertake it, if an older man like myself would help him with it. The work was quickly taken in hand, a little establishment was provided, and later on enlarged. He, himself, in March 1852, just as he was entering on his twenty-fourth year, selected for his own benevolent purposes three of the worst young criminals in London, who were about to be discharged from prison. George Bengough resided for the first few months in my house, and worked with me. Then he removed to some rooms in the reformatory itself. For two years he worked in the ranks as a schoolmaster.

¹ *War with Crime*, pp. xix-xx.

When the undertaking was fully established he left the superintendence of it confidently in my hands.'

He was then suffering from ill-health, and shortly afterwards died.

'Cheltenham alone formerly produced almost as many young thieves as all the rest of the county put together. In the year 1852 forty-five boys were imprisoned; four years later fifty-three. After long endeavours we found out who were the leaders and who the apprentices in crime. We caught the two young master thieves, and behold! in the year 1857 only fourteen boys were convicted. Thereupon we turned our attention to the rest of the county with equal success. In the last five years England has been covered with reformatories for young criminals. Institutions of this kind caused a decrease within the same space of time of 6,000 criminals yearly. It is a great thing to rescue alive one human being who has fallen over a precipice, but far greater yet to prevent *two* from falling over the precipice at all.'

The genesis of the criminal class of boys in London a few years since is thus graphically described in a sketch of the life of Dr. Barnardo, and in what led to his taking an interest in them. The following is an account of his first seeing a number of boys of this class under the guidance of one of them:

'There, exposed upon the dome-shaped roof, with their heads upon the higher part, and their feet somewhere in the gutter, but in a great variety of postures—some coiled up, as one may have seen dogs before a fire; some huddled two or three together, others more apart—lay eleven boys on the open roof. No covering of any kind was upon them. The rags that most of them wore were mere apologies for clothes, apparently quite as bad, if not even worse, than Jim's. One big fellow who lay there seemed to be about eighteen years old; but the ages of the remainder varied, I should say, from nine to fourteen. Just then the moon shone clearly out. I have already said it was a bitterly cold, dry night, and as the pale light of the moon fell upon the upturned faces of those poor boys, and as I, standing there, realized for one awful moment, the terrible fact that they were all absolutely homeless and destitute, and were perhaps the samples of numbers of others, it seemed as though the Hand of God Himself had suddenly pulled aside the curtain which concealed from my view the untold miseries of forlorn child-life upon the streets of London.'

Some weeks later Dr. Barnardo was dining at a great man's house, when Lord Shaftesbury and some other philanthropists were present. To them he gave an account of

¹ *War with Crime*, p. xxiii.

² *Review of Reviews*, July 1896, p. 20.

what he
the trust

'A
to Billin
not a bo
him, bu
come ou
head wa
crates, l
with a
lair whe
out by t
the lamp
the des
regimen

At
be assu
destitu
there i
in orde
compar
has hac
rowing
were jo
that th
comput

Sin
End fri
been es
into wh
whom
with th
failures
have b
enable
he is s
more ti
down v
as to th

'I
healthy
dity has
former
And the

what he had seen, and they resolved to go at once and test the truth of what he had related :

'A strange sight it was, that of the West End revellers straying to Billingsgate seeking outcasts—and finding none. For there was not a boy to be seen. For a moment Barnardo's heart sank within him, but a policeman standing by said it was all right. "They'll come out," he said, "if you give them a copper." A halfpenny a head was offered, and then from out a great confused pile of old crates, boxes, and empty barrels which were piled together, covered with a huge tarpaulin, seventy-three boys crawled out from the lair where they had been seeking a shelter for the night. Called out by the offer of a halfpenny, there they stood, beneath the light of the lamps, a sorrowful and mournful regiment of the great army of the destitute, confronting an even more sorrowful and mournful regiment of the well-to-do.'¹

At the same time it is necessary to add, that it must not be assumed that all these boys were the victims of extreme destitution : for there are boys who desert their homes, where there is at all events a sufficiency of food found for them, in order to enjoy the wild freedom of a reckless life in the company of lads like themselves. The writer of this article has had to listen to the complaints of aggrieved parents sorrowing over the desertion of their homes by their sons, who were joined with others in this kind of Arab life, and desiring that they might be sent to an Industrial School, and so be compulsorily kept out of harm's way.

Since that time (1866) when Dr. Barnardo took his West End friends to see the East End Arabs, eighty-two homes have been established by him for the reception of destitute children, into which more than 26,000 of them have been received ; of whom no less than 7,310 have been emigrated to Canada, with the gratifying result that only two per cent. have been failures, and that in a little more than four years 3,175 $\frac{1}{2}$ have been repaid by those whom they had emigrated. To enable Dr. Barnardo to carry on these extensive operations he is sustained by voluntary subscriptions to the amount of more than 150,000*l.* a year. With the principle that he lays down we cordially agree, though we should no doubt differ as to the manner of carrying out some portions of it :

'I have myself proved over and over again that a new and healthy environment is more powerful to transform than even heredity has been in planting and evolving taint. Change and purify the former early enough and the latter will disappear in a generation. And there is no factor so omnipotent to change the environment as

¹ *Review of Reviews*, July 1896, p. 21.

the influence of a true and real religious life. Spite, therefore, of what the scoffers say, the religion of Jesus Christ has done and can do more for the children of the slums than anything else.¹

A few years later, in 1881, there was started 'The Church of England Incorporated Society for providing Homes for Waifs and Strays,' in order that the Church might herself take care of her outcast little ones. The rule both in these homes and in those of Dr. Barnardo is that 'no really destitute child is ever refused'; and the Society for providing Homes for Waifs and Strays assures us in its Reports that it takes every care in no way to relieve parents of the responsibility of their children, and either refuses those who seek admission simply for the parents to get rid of the burden of supporting them, or requires payment from them sufficient to provide for their support. This Society has over 66 homes, in which 2,500 children are being cared for. The Memorandum of Association describes the objects of the Society thus:

'To receive destitute and neglected children of both sexes in homes of the Society, or in other homes carried on in connexion with the Church of England, or to board them out in suitable cottages and homes, or to provide them with board, lodging, clothing, education, and recreation in such other manner as may be expedient, and to educate them in the principles of the Church of England.'

It also proposes to find suitable places and employment for them, and, where it is desirable, to assist them to emigrate. Believing that the object the Society has in view of effectually training children in habits of religion and virtue is most successfully accomplished by placing them in homes that accommodate a comparatively small number of inmates, rather than by massing them in large numbers in spacious buildings where the influence of those in charge is necessarily more limited, this Society has only thirty-four children upon an average in each of its homes; only three of them accommodating more than fifty each, and twelve of them not receiving more than ten each. The ordinary income of the Society is about 50,000*l.* a year. The results of the education given in the two classes of homes to which we have called attention are described by those who are responsible for them as most satisfactory. Notwithstanding the unpromising character of the children gathered into the homes thus provided for them, it is found that under the religious and moral training under which they are placed for a few years, all, but a very small percentage of them, are completely weaned from the vicious

¹ *Report*, 1888, p. 15.

tender
fluence
and us

In
it wou
that h
in Pru
Lond
intent
found
Societ
he giv

'I
men, p
commu
themse

and

'I furt
directe
it appe
men, a
to othe
minded

For so
1835,
Orpha
God v
for its
purpos

'T
House
God t
parent
good f
getting
first an
be mag
with al
asked
God is

In Ap
accom
Orpha

tendencies which they manifested in early life under the influences in which they were then placed, and become virtuous and useful members of society.

In speaking of schools for educating neglected children, it would not be right to omit mention of a remarkable effort that has been made at Bristol by Mr. George Müller. Born in Prussia in 1810, after an unpromising youth he came to London in 1829, under strong religious convictions, with the intention of becoming a missionary to the Jews. He soon found himself unable to comply with the requirements of the Society that he had come to England to work with. For this he gives the following reasons :

‘I could not conscientiously submit to be ordained by unconverted men, professing to have power to set me apart for the ministry, or to communicate something to me for this work which they do not possess themselves ;’

and

‘I further had a conscientious objection against being led and directed by *men* in my missionary labours. As a servant of Christ, it appeared to me I ought to be guided by the Spirit, and not by men, as to time and place ; and this I would say, with all deference to others, who may be much more taught and much more spiritually minded than myself.’¹

For some years he worked as a Dissenting minister ; and in 1835, when labouring at Bristol, he determined to open an Orphanage, relying upon the answers which he felt assured God would give to prayer to supply all that was needed for its equipment and maintenance. He thus describes his purpose :

‘This, then, was the primary reason for establishing the Orphan House. I certainly did from my heart desire to be used by God to benefit the bodies of poor children, bereaved of both parents, and seek in other respects with the help of God to do them good for this life ; I also particularly longed to be used by God in getting the dear orphans trained up in the fear of God ; but still the first and primary object of the work was (and still is) that God might be magnified by the fact that the orphans under my care are provided with all they need only by *prayer and faith*, without anyone being asked by me or my fellow-labourers, whereby it may be seen that God is faithful still, and hears prayer still.’²

In April 1836 a house was opened for an Orphanage able to accommodate thirty children. Mr. Müller has now permanent Orphanages sufficient to accommodate 2,050 children ; but the

¹ *The Lord's Dealings with George Müller*, i. 50.

² *Ibid.* p. 146.

supply exceeds the demand, for he circulates a paper in which he says :

'As we have now a great number of vacancies for girls in our five large Orphan houses, erected to receive 2,050 boys and girls, who have lost both parents by death, I earnestly request Christian friends kindly to assist me in filling up these vacancies, by seeking out suitable cases for admission into our Institution. When I began my Orphan Work sixty years ago, there was accommodation in this country for 3,600 orphans only ; but since that time, through the blessing of God, which has rested so abundantly on my labours, such an impetus has been given to orphan work, that institutions have sprung up in various parts of Great Britain, by means of which more than 100,000 orphans can now be provided for ; and for this reason it is that we have so many vacancies at the present time, and find it so difficult to fill them up.'¹

The annual cost for the maintenance of these homes is over 23,000*l.* Mr. Müller's religious views differ widely from ours, but it is impossible not to admire the faith and patience with which he has carried on his work during so long a period, or to doubt that he has done much to relieve the material wants of numberless destitute children, and to further their spiritual interests to the best of his ability.

We turn from what has been accomplished by private benevolence to what has been effected by Reformatories and Industrial Schools, to the support of which a large amount is contributed annually from the Exchequer and local taxation. Something has been already said about Reformatories which owed much to the zeal and determination of Mr. Barwick Baker, who was not only instrumental in establishing and sustaining one in the county of Gloucester, but by his public advocacy of such institutions did much towards inspiring others with a resolve to do for their own neighbourhoods what he had done for his. It ought also to be said that he was anticipated by many years in commencing an establishment of the kind. So far back as the year 1788 the Philanthropic Society commenced, in a very small way, its operations. Its object was to protect poor children, and especially the offspring of convicted felons, from falling into vices, and reclaiming them when they had done so. It began its work in the village of Hackney, where the children were trained in cottage homes. It then migrated to St. George's Fields, Southwark, and in 1849 removed to Redhill, where for

¹ From a paper inserted in a copy of Mr. Müller's last Report. Possibly an announcement that has recently appeared in the papers may have a similar origin. It is to the effect that Dr. Barnardo is prepared to receive into his homes a thousand destitute Armenian children.

many
work
out a
and so
the gr
of wh
numb
these
from
Th
and n
fifteen
Schoo
princi
clings
up in
Indus
to a c
an in
into
rather
inflict
impr
has b
begin
in Re
1864-
1,790
had b
sent
annua
the la
It
wise
case
would
would
are m
doer
nothi
seriou
comm
sight
those
are li

many years it has most successfully carried on the important work for which it was founded. It commenced by placing out a single infant to nurse; and since then it has trained and sent out into the world more than 6,000 young people, the greater part of whom are doing well, and more than a fourth of whom have emigrated to the colonies, whilst a still larger number have enlisted in the army; and concerning most of these the chaplain has received very satisfactory accounts from the officers in command.

There are now forty-one Reformatory schools in England, and nine in Scotland, which is a decrease of twelve in the last fifteen years. The reason for this decrease is that Industrial Schools have become much more popular than Reformatories, principally because it has been thought that the prison taint clings more closely in after life to those who had been brought up in Reformatories than to those who had been educated in Industrial Schools—the law having required that previous to a child's reception into a Reformatory, it shall have been an inmate for some days in a prison, whereas, for admission into an Industrial School imprisonment was a hindrance rather than a requirement. With the growing tendency to inflict lighter punishments, the necessity for a child being imprisoned before it could be admitted into a Reformatory has been removed by Act of Parliament; but the table at the beginning of this Article shows that the number of children in Reformatories has diminished from 1,228 annually between 1864–68, to 1,161 annually between 1889–93; but ran up to 1,790 in 1894, when the necessity for previous imprisonment had been removed. At the same time the number of children sent to Industrial Schools increased from an average of 966 annually during the earlier period just named to 6,737 during the later.

It is a question not to be decided offhand whether it was wise to dispense with the disgrace of imprisonment in the case of a small theft. People who are governed by sentiment would unhesitatingly plead for the abolition of what they would regard as degrading; on the other hand, those who are most anxious for the thorough reformation of the wrong-doer would be inclined to cling to the old requirement. For nothing has a greater tendency to further reformation than a serious shock; the being compelled to recognize that the commission of a vice or a crime has brought disgrace in the sight of the world, has lowered the offender in the eyes of those whose good opinion he regards. Small vices or crimes are little thought of so long as they do not affect the trans-

gressor's position; but being sentenced to imprisonment is a serious matter, and the first time such a sentence is inflicted must make those on whom it is passed realize their position more than being committed to an Industrial School, as a child may be sent there without its moral position being felt by it to be lowered. Mr. Barwick Baker, who did so much towards the establishment of Reformatories, thus speaks on the subject:

'A man till he has been caught rarely brings it to his own mind that he is stealing. He thinks that he is only *taking* some unconsidered trifle. It has been truly said that a man falls into crime at first as he falls into love or into a pond. He hardly knows where he is until he finds himself floundering in the midst of it. Now, if such a one be sent to prison for three or four months, he is at first horrified at his situation. His first few days are misery. But it is one of the mercies of nature that suffering lessens by habit. At the present moment I speak feelingly. I have been confined to my bed or chair for five weeks. At the first I was longing to be at my usual pleasures or work. Now the sick-room has become a habit, and I take it contentedly. Catch a wild bird and tame him; he will scarcely live through the first week, but if he live for a month he becomes used to it, and by the end of six months will, if released, scarcely know how to find food. So it is with a prisoner. Keep him for three or four months, and when he comes out he will tell his friends, "Gaol is very bad at first, but never mind it; it is not half so bad when you get used to it." Can anything produce an effect more diametrically opposite to our intentions for the repression of crime? Whereas, if we imprison him for a week or ten days—whatever time will give the lowest diet and the sharpest punishment, according to the rules of the particular gaol—he will tell his friends that gaol is the most horrible place imaginable; that a week or ten days nearly starved him, and that next time he is to have six months, and he doubts if he can live through it.'¹

The question whether a few days' imprisonment is good or bad, likely to deter from future crime or to hang as a dead weight round the neck of him who has been subjected to it for the rest of his life, is one incapable of positive decision. The sentimental tendencies of the present day have naturally decided against it.

We can, however, turn to the records concerning Reformatories and Industrial Schools with real satisfaction. They are managed for the most part by benevolent individuals, inspired by an ardent desire to reclaim the erring, and to attract by their example and influence to the paths of virtue those who have unfortunately had no advantages in their childhood.

¹ *War with Crime*, p. 65.

The m
lost on
been le
There
Englan
under
and 79
these s
concer
three y
cerning
portion
than o
had be
inform
been m
imposs
well' i

'Th
may be
absolute
therefor
a great
doubt t
of them
had alr
find th
training
there w
fit for
respect
to the s

As
from th

'Th
year 18
results
females
and 13

Wh
into R
10,851
crime,
be rega

¹ *Re
VOL*

The majority of those sent to them are illegitimate, or have lost one or both parents, or have been deserted by them and been left on the world with no one to teach or to guide them. There are now actively at work 39 Reformatory schools in England and 9 in Scotland, and at the end of 1895 there were under detention in them 4,112 boys and 508 girls in England, and 799 boys and 124 girls in Scotland. The managers of these schools have to send a return to Government annually concerning the children who have left during the preceding three years; and it is gratifying to find that the report concerning three-fourths of the boys and nearly as large a proportion of the girls is that 'they were doing well'; while less than one in six of the boys and one in seventeen of the girls had been convicted during that period; of the remainder no information had been received, or the information that had been received was of that doubtful character that made it impossible to classify them. The value of the report 'doing well' is thus carefully set forth:

'The term "doing well" is one of very elastic application, and may be made to include every variety of moral condition between absolute failure and excellent conduct. Entire dependence cannot therefore be unreservedly placed on these figures. But we received a great mass of evidence which satisfied us beyond all reasonable doubt that the training given in these schools, especially in the best of them, was such as to reclaim the great majority, even of those who had already commenced a career of crime. It was not unusual to find that such was the confidence inspired by the treatment and training of girls in all respects proper inmates of reformatories, that there was no difficulty in finding for them, the moment they became fit for licence or discharge, employment as domestic servants in respectable families, where they conducted themselves in most cases to the satisfaction of their employers.'¹

As illustrative of this it may be well to quote the following from the same Report:

'The prison reports of offenders recognized in prison during the year 1895 as having been in a Reformatory School give the following results:—The number so identified was 1,052, viz. males 805, females 25, total 830, in English and Welsh prisons; and 209 males and 13 females, total 222, in Scotch prisons.'²

When it is remembered that there have been admitted into Reformatories since their establishment 50,029 boys and 10,851 girls, all of whom must have been convicted of some crime, and many of them several times over, the failures must be regarded as very much less than could have been expected,

¹ *Report on Reformatories, &c.*, p. 17.
VOL. XLIII.—NO. LXXXVI.

² *Ibid.* p. 18.
I I

more especially when we are told in the last official report on Reformatories that those convicted during the year (1895) were 'for offences of a very trivial character: only one in fifty of the males in England, and one in twenty-five in Scotland, and no females in either, were sentenced to penal servitude.' Most of the sentences were for some days' imprisonment, and '16 ex-inmates of Reformatories were imprisoned during the year 1895 for playing football in the streets.'¹

When we turn to Industrial Schools we find the number of institutions much larger. Last year there were fifty-seven for boys and forty-five for girls, and four for both boys and girls in Scotland. The difference between Reformatories and Industrial Schools is thus described:

'A Reformatory is a school to which are sent juveniles up to the age of 16 who have been convicted of an offence punishable with penal servitude or imprisonment, and such children need not, by the Act of 1893, serve a previous term of 10 days in prison. An Industrial School, on the other hand, is designed, broadly speaking, for children up to the age of 14, who may not actually have committed an offence, but whose circumstances are such that if left to their surroundings they are likely to join the delinquent population. Thus Reformatories are intended for actual, Industrial Schools for potential, delinquents, and the former contain children some three years older, on an average, than the latter.'²

There were at the end of 1895 10,788 boys and 3,165 girls in English Industrial Schools, and 3,474 boys and 1,363 girls in Scotch. And the reports concerning those who had been discharged during the three previous years were somewhat better than those relating to the children discharged from Reformatories. Eighty-three per cent. of the boys, and eighty-two per cent. of the girls, were reported as doing well, and only six per cent. of the boys and one per cent. of the girls had been convicted during the three years over which the inquiry extends.

'Of the Industrial Schools 7, viz. Durham, Cumberland, Kent, Mayford, Stafford boys, Stafford girls, and Feltham, were established by county authorities; 9, viz. Leeds boys and girls, Leicester, Bristol girls, Brentwood, the 'Shaftesbury' (training ship), Middlesborough, Brighton and Hull girls, are managed by School Boards; and 1, Shustoke, by the Corporation of Birmingham. The remainder of the Industrial Schools and all the Reformatories owe their existence to voluntary and independent efforts.'³ 'By the returns of the Board it appears that up to March 25, 1896, no less than 22,315

¹ *Report on Reformatories, &c.*, p. 18.

² *Ibid.* p. 8.

³ *Reformatory, &c.*, *Report*, 1895, p. 7.

children
Board
instanc
School
out of

In
Asqui
Reform
matter
both b
model
comm
No di
of the
there i
promo
buted
and m
teachi
teache
teachi
or ind
cases v
Reform
they s
ments,
inquir
tion gi
though
ing the
an app
dentall
Reform
charac
repres
classifi
favour
classifi
charac
upon:
for the
that in
profita
for the

children have been sent to Industrial Schools from the London Board district since 1871. The total number committed at the instance of School Boards in 1895 (including 788 by the London School Board) was 2,059 out of a total of 3,015 in England, and 93 out of a total of 971 in Scotland.¹

In 1895 a Departmental Committee was appointed by Mr. Asquith to inquire into certain matters connected with the Reformatory and Industrial Schools, the principal of these matters being: 'The general state of the schools, their control both by Government and Local authority, and the framing of model rules and their application to particular schools.' This committee reported in the November of the following year. No direction having been given to inquire into the character of the religious and moral training provided by these schools, there is no report upon it; this is the more strange as the promoters and supporters of these schools have always attributed their great success to the instruction relative to religion and morals given in them, the discipline by which such teaching was enforced, and the example and lives of the teachers. Whilst saying nothing of the religious and moral teaching given in these institutions, of 'which the committee or individual members of our body have visited—in most cases without sending notice beforehand—40 of the 47 land Reformatories, and 122 of the 133 land Industrial Schools,' they say a good deal about the secular educational arrangements, concerning which they had no more directions to inquire than they had about the religious and moral instruction given, and which it would consequently seem that they thought of more importance. But of the results of the training they say a good deal, and in what they do say there is an apparent inclination to belittle its beneficial effects incidentally by representing that the number of children sent to Reformatories and Industrial Schools is excessive, that the character of those sent is much less unfavourable than is represented by the authorities, that the terms used in the classification of those who have left admit of a much less favourable interpretation than is suggested by the words of classification that are used. This is emphasized by the character of the comment put upon the system now acted upon: that the time of detention is too long, and is extended for the benefit of the institutions rather than of the children; that industrial employments are selected because they are profitable to the school funds, and not because they are best for the children; that the managers refuse to transfer the

¹ *Reformatory, &c., Report, 1895, p. 28.*

children to school ships when the interests of the children require it; that unpromising children are systematically returned to friends when other provision ought to be made for them. With respect to the reformation of character by Reformatories, there was evidently great difference of opinion amongst the members of the Commission, some desiring to make as little as possible of it, whilst others were desirous to give a candid estimate of it. To reconcile these divergencies of opinion witnesses on both sides are quoted, and the conclusions at which they had arrived are stated,¹ but in the drawing up of the Report there seems to be a bias adverse to the institutions.

'Our conclusions as to the "Results" of disposals from these schools may be thus summed up:—1. The Committee are agreed as to the value to be attached to the official return. Some of us hold that the return is open to little objection in respect of form, and that the actual facts relating to the children substantially correspond with the figures of the return. Others of us are of opinion that owing to its defective classification, and to the circumstances set forth in pages 72-75, the return cannot be accepted as a satisfactory basis for an estimate of the work done by these schools.

'2. But whilst holding different views about the value of the return, we are satisfied that a large number of those who have left these schools are leading a respectable and fairly prosperous life.

'3. Whether judged by a moral or material standard there are also a number of failures. In estimating these failures consideration should be given to the position of the average boy or girl of the same class as those in these schools. Nor is a failure necessarily to be regarded as permanent. And the distinction has to be kept in view between failures that are inevitable, or are to be expected, and failures that are preventable.'²

There is then a careful explanation of what is intended by the terms 'inevitable' and 'preventable' failures.

To enable a fairer judgment to be formed of the value of the conclusions arrived at by this Commission when it differs from the official Reports of the training given in Reformatories and Industrial Schools, it may be well to quote their own description of the authorities on which they rely.

'These [the official] returns upon so important a subject as the general results of the training at Reformatories and Industrial Schools—officially published every year for a long series of years, during this period never seriously questioned, and often quoted in scientific writings, in official documents and in Parliament—must have largely contributed to the value assigned by the public to these institutions. To check these returns is beyond our power; but we have thought

¹ *Report*, p. 9.

² *Ibid.* p. 80.

it our
parin
with
quali
but it
small
cases
to em
real o
in the
tion,
recogn
are fo
be rel
ploye
of boy
institi

T
The
ably
Scot
out t
who s
Qu'A
Chur
state
under
the o
boys
ports
instit
and f
forma
spoke
be th
procu
train
perce
valida
dimin
it giv
the o
polita
eviden
femal

it our duty to use what opportunities were available to us for comparing the results thus furnished by the managers of those schools with the experience of independent persons. The persons best qualified to speak would be the employers of those boys and girls, but it would have been impracticable for us to consult more than a small number, and it would have been open to question whether the cases selected formed fair samples of the whole. Besides, a reference to employers, even if made with care, might have caused an injury, real or fancied, to the Reformatory and Industrial School boys or girls in their service. We have therefore made no attempt in this direction, but to prevent misunderstanding we wish to say that we fully recognize that in a considerable proportion of these cases the returns are founded upon reports from employers, and to this extent are to be relied upon. Nor can we doubt that in many other cases employers, if consulted, would have been able to give a good account of boys and girls who came to them directly or otherwise from these institutions.¹

The appeal is then made to the independent authorities.² The Chief Constables of Edinburgh and Preston speak favourably of these boys. The statistical inquiry made by the Scotch Departmental Prison Committee substantially bears out the results stated in the official Report. Lord Brassey, who sent out a large consignment of emigrants to his farms near Qu'Appelle, and among these were several boys from the Church Farm Industrial School, is reported to have since stated in public that, of all these emigrants who had gone out under an engagement to serve a certain time at these farms, the only ones who had carried out their engagements were the boys from Church Farm. On the other hand, there are reports from the managers of homes in which boys from the institutions under consideration, and from Poor Law Schools, and from the streets, are lodged, in which the boys from Reformatories and Industrial Schools are much less favourably spoken of. These would, no doubt, to a considerable extent be the failures for whom no favourable situation could be procured when they left the institutions where they had been trained; and as these institutions always state a considerable percentage of failures, such evidence cannot be held to invalidate the truth of what is stated in the official Report, or diminish the confidence which may be placed upon the figures it gives. With regard to girls sent out from these institutions the only witness cited is Miss Poole, secretary of the Metropolitan Association for befriending Young Servants. Her evidence is undoubtedly not favourable to the results of the female training in these institutions; but the evidence of one

¹ *Report*, pp. 75, 76.

² *Ibid.* pp. 76-79.

witness, however able and experienced, cannot be regarded as conclusive, as it must mainly deal with girls drawn from one locality, and possibly placed under specially trying conditions.

The question whether it would not be better to get rid of voluntary managers for institutions of this kind was evidently raised, and the conclusions arrived at are worth mentioning :

'Most of the existing defects would disappear under State administration : many of them (in course of time) under administration by local authorities. But the personal interest of individuals is so invaluable, wherever it exists, that in our opinion voluntary management ought on no account to be superseded. If in some schools there has been too much routine, and seclusion, and indiscriminate treatment of the children in masses, and on a somewhat inferior footing, the greatest blessing that could be conferred upon the schools would be that more and more interest should be taken in them by persons of refinement, education, and benevolence—interest not merely in the financial and administrative affairs of the school, but in the life of the school, in the superintendent, staff, and children. It may be that the best examples of such interest are to be found in voluntary managers of small schools. But we must not be understood to disparage management by county councils or school boards.

'If the schools passed into the hands of the Government, the State would no doubt carry them on in an unexceptionable manner, and would supply the defects which, under voluntary management, have arisen from insufficiency of funds ; but what for children of this neglected class is most important, if they are to be restored to society, that they would be unable to provide. We mean the co-operation of individual men and women, who as friends, not as officials, would associate themselves with these children just as they would with other children, and so keep off from them any feeling that they belonged to an inferior class, and were forgotten.'

Before leaving the recently presented Report of the Commission it may be well to say something more of their recommendations respecting Reformatories and Industrial Schools for the future. With their proposal that any new Reformatories and Industrial Schools that may be established should accommodate only a small number of inmates, as is now arranged by the Society for helping Waifs and Strays, and that so far as practicable they should be classified so as to admit children of about the same age, we quite agree : but we think that the Commission must have forgotten that they were dealing with criminal, or quasi-criminal, children, when they recommend a system of boarding-out ; for why should foster-parents be

¹ *Report*, pp. 104-105.

more
thieves
their r
of the
we ha
But co
previo
of the
Report
recom
Reform
'On th
school,
determ
of the
ment a
altoget
opinio

To no
tion.

And
been
establ

'As th
going
breakf
for the
and m
allowe
classes
followe
leave t
or Ind

There
Engla
were a
Inspe

'I
condu
practic
the In
with c
Indus
victio

more capable of restraining from wrong-doing incipient thieves than their own parents have been? With respect to their recommendations about a rearrangement and increase of the grants to new institutions, we have nothing to say, as we have not attempted to deal with that part of the subject. But concerning the wisdom of a short term of imprisonment previous to admission to a Reformatory, the recommendations of the Commissioners are not clear. On the same page of the Report we have these two statements: 'For these reasons we recommend that, as hitherto, children should be sent to a Reformatory only on conviction'; and

'On the whole, however, we consider this inequality inside the school, and this inequality between England and Scotland—inequality determined by the opinions of the magistrates, and not by the merits of the case—ought not to be continued, and we advise that imprisonment as a preliminary to detention in a reformatory school should altogether be abolished. In this view we are confirmed by the opinions of the inspectors.'¹

To no other part of the Report do we desire to draw attention.

An extension of Industrial Schools in a modified form has been made since 1879. Day Industrial Schools were then established, and

'As the name implies, they only receive day scholars, the children going to them early in the morning in time to receive a substantial breakfast; at midday they have dinner, and before being dismissed for the day tea is supplied to them. The children are well taught, and more or less industrial occupation is carried on, due time being allowed for recreation. The inmates are taken from the very poorest classes. The results after discharge from these schools cannot be followed as they ought to be from Industrial Schools. The children leave the schools, and, unless they reappear again in Reformatories or Industrial Schools, are lost sight of.'²

There are now twenty-three of these schools—twenty in England and three in Scotland—and at the end of 1895 there were attending them 2,345 boys and 878 girls. Her Majesty's Inspector remarks concerning them:

'I confidently believe that if all the schools in the country were conducted in the spirit of these schools, wilful truancy would be practically unknown. They are, moreover, specially interesting to the Inspector; they enable him to compare children living at home with children living in boarding schools. In fairness to the ordinary Industrial Schools of the country, I must record my emphatic conviction that I did not find at my examination in 1895 that the children

¹ *Report*, p. 100.

² *Ibid.* p. 31.

in the schoolrooms of ordinary Industrial Schools were as a general rule less bright or more mechanical in their methods than the children in the Day Industrial Schools.¹

There is yet another form of schools to be named before we have completed our account of the provision made in order to secure that no child of the classes for whom elementary education has to be provided shall grow up without such instruction as the State deems to be absolutely necessary. It was found after a few years' experience that, notwithstanding the terrors of the law, a number of children were never found at school. To meet their case a school for truants was commenced at Liverpool in December 1878, and since then thirteen others have been established by different School Boards, and in these schools at the end of 1895 there were 1,221 children, while 4,503 others were out on licence. Concerning these schools Her Majesty's Inspector thus writes :

'Truant Schools were primarily designed to be industrial schools of short duration for mere truants, or, as it is expressed in the truant vernacular, children who "hop the wag." Their usefulness has, in my opinion, been much crippled by the facilities afforded by subsection (2) of section 11 of the Elementary Education Act, 1876, for the sending to a short detention school of children who are fit cases for an ordinary industrial school. Such children are constantly in and out, and dose after dose of detention for a few weeks or months is a mere irritant to them, while to make them dread return a strictness of discipline has in cases been devised which comes hard on the genuine truant who merely avoids school, but has not taken to petty larceny, and does not consort with those who have. I was struck during 1895 with the fact that, though the Truant Schools are all managed by Board Schools, the standard of education reached in several of them was distinctly below what I was accustomed to find in ordinary industrial schools.'²

The number and cost of the various institutions for child reformation supported in whole or in part from public sources are now very considerable. In 1870 there were 5,433 children under detention in Reformatories; in 1895 the number was 5,633, and the total cost 109,290*l.*, or 17*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* for each child. The Industrial Schools had grown at a much more rapid rate: in 1870 there were 8,788 children detained in them; in 1895 (including Truant Schools) 24,577, and the total expenditure upon them was 377,146*l.*, or 15*l.* 6*s.* 10*d.* for each child. The Day Industrial Schools also showed a great increase: the number in detention in them in 1879 being 287, and in 1895, 3,223, while the total expenditure upon them was 29,213*l.*, or 8*l.* per child, the smallness of this

¹ *Reformatories Report*, 1895, p. 32.

² *Ibid.* p. 29.

sum h
childre
The p
of the
Industr
20,870
nation

It
made
provis
confor
and d
that t
is clea
provid
do no
of Re
who h
stood
When
When
of wh
begin
enviro
racter
subje
ordin
of the
childr
and c
is it
which
Scho
that
upon
that
main
rality
crimi
spirit
of th
the li
defec
is ve
Refo

sum being accounted for by the large proportion of the children being out on licence, and therefore costing nothing. The parents are compellable to contribute towards the cost of the maintenance of their children in Reformatories and Industrial Schools, and in 1895 there was received from them 20,870*l.*; voluntary subscription supplied 28,836*l.*; and the national Exchequer and local rates the remainder.

It will be seen from what has been said that the efforts made to diminish juvenile crime are very extended, and that provision seems to have been made by Churchmen and Non-conformists sufficient for meeting the wants of the orphan and deserted children, from whose ranks it might be expected that the largest number of criminals would be developed. It is clear that many avail themselves of the advantages thus provided; but it is to be feared that there are also many who do not. It is most satisfactory to note the remarkable success of Reformatories and Industrial Schools in reclaiming children who have been led into the commission of crime, or who have stood at the edge of the pit of evil, ready to fall into it. When these things are taken into account, we naturally ask, Whence then comes the increasing tide of criminal children, of whom the official Report, from which we quoted at the beginning of this Article, speaks? Are they victims of their environment? Are their home surroundings of such a character that when we have treated successfully all that are subjected to special trials and temptations, we find that the ordinary average household of numbers of the poorer classes of the population is such as to furnish no protection to the children brought up in them against the allurements of vice and crime which they will certainly have to encounter? Or is it that the want of that instruction in definite religion which is given to children in Reformatories and Industrial Schools leaves the many who live in their own homes without that only safeguard against evil which can be really relied upon? This is certainly an anxious and important question that ought to be inquired into. If the public institutions maintained wholly or partially by the State and by the liberality of philanthropic individuals place the vicious and criminally disposed children in a better position, morally and spiritually, and consequently materially, than a large number of those who are brought up under the ordinary conditions of the life of working-class people, there is evidently a serious defect in our present educational arrangements. This point is very well stated by Mr. Barwick Baker in his paper on Reformatory schools:

'There is yet another point to be most zealously watched and guarded against: namely, that we do not allow the warm interest we take in the criminals under our care—or our own natural vanity in turning them out as creditably to ourselves as may be—to induce us to give them superior advantages, and thus make them an object of envy to the innocent. It must always be difficult to avoid this. We are all prone—the educated more than the uneducated—to think others better off than ourselves; but if there were once raised a general feeling that admission to a school of this kind is a thing to be desired, we should, I fear, have done a positive evil to the many which would outweigh whatever benefits we could give to the few.'¹

With this we agree thus far, that if such is the case, the gulf that needs to be bridged over must be spanned by improving the advantages provided for the innocent, and not by diminishing those now in operation for the benefit of the guilty. We have seen that Dr. Barnardo asserts confidently that the orphanages in which he is interested implant in the minds of their occupants principles sufficiently strong to overmaster the seeds of evil sown by their early environment. The Church of England Society for Providing Homes for Waifs and Strays assures us that most of the children taken under its care turn out well in after life; and so does Mr. Müller concerning those who have been educated in his orphanages. Can the same thing be said of all the elementary schools of the country to which the poorer portions of the community are compelled to send their children? That it can be said of many of them, we do not doubt; but that it cannot be said of all of them we feel equally assured. And believing as we do that, not only all our educational authorities, but politicians of all schools of thought are anxious that the children educated in our elementary schools should become honest, sober, and pure members of the community, we would earnestly entreat them to obtain for all who are brought before the magistrates for breaches of the criminal law a statement of all the schools which they have attended, so that if an undue proportion of them have been educated in any particular school, the character of the moral and religious instruction given in that school, and the influence of its teachers, may be inquired into, in order that the necessary steps may be taken to secure its improvement. Until some measures of this kind have been required by law, we move blindly along, hopelessly lamenting the state of things in the midst of which we find ourselves, but shrinking from taking the first most necessary step to probe the wound to the bottom.

¹ *War against Crime*, p. 166.

A Crim
S
th
of
T

PROFE
volum
the tex
we des
very l
pact st
and ye
'besid
discuss
statem
of the
a state
subject

There
us abu
pelled
ance, a
especi
of the
'inter-
ecclesi
(Edito
a rule,
a deci
men o
have u
over a
lead to
from t
editors
which
sects r
a work
Cathol
Nicens
ask th
a few
speak
and th
Yet Pr
men a
serious

SHORT NOTICES.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark. By the Rev. EZRA P. GOULD, S.T.D., Professor of the New Testament Literature and Language, Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896.)

PROFESSOR GOULD has bestowed considerable care upon this volume of the International Critical Commentary, especially upon the text and the relation of the first three Gospels to each other, and we desire to recognize this first of all. We can add that he has been very loyal to the purpose of the general editors in aiming at a compact style. No one will complain of the unwieldy size of the book, and yet it contains, in Professor Gould's own words,

'besides the notes, an introduction, stating the synoptical problem, a discussion of the characteristics of Mark, and an analysis of events; a statement of the Person and principles of Jesus in Mark; a discussion of the Gospels in the second century; a review of recent literature; and a statement of the sources of the text. There are also notes on special subjects scattered through the book' (Pref. p. vi).

There is a variety of treatment on all these topics, which would afford us abundant materials for quotation and comment; but we are compelled to choose one topic from the rest by reason of its unique importance, and to illustrate it as fully as we can for the benefit of our readers, especially of those who are in holy orders. This topic is the claim of the volume to take its place in what the general editors call an 'inter-confessional' series of commentaries 'free from polemical and ecclesiastical bias,' and 'designed chiefly for students and clergymen' (Editor's Preface). Our experience has taught us what to expect, as a rule, from language of this kind. It generally means that there is a decided bias against certain clearly defined dogmas which clergymen of the Church of England have professed that they believe and have undertaken to teach. More often than not it results in slurring over any truth to which any sect is likely to object. Rarely does it lead to the inclusion of every truth which any sect may hold, and from the circumstances of the case an undenominational, or, as the editors prefer to say, an inter-confessional commentary is a book which overreaches itself, and in trying to win the applause of all sects meets the real wants of none. The whole conception of such a work is, it is needless to say, utterly opposed to the position of the Catholic Church, which believes in the 'one faith,' as expressed in the Nicene Creed. If there are clergymen who think otherwise we will ask them to direct their attention to Professor Gould's treatment of a few crucial points. It is not the custom in the English Church to speak of 'Mark' and 'Jesus,' as if St. Mark were a profane writer and the only Saviour of men on a level with His own creatures. Yet Professor Gould does this *passim*; and we suppose that Churchmen are to be content because some sects are satisfied. A more serious point is to be found in the comments on the perpetual

virginity of the Lord's Mother. That has been regarded, not indeed as an article of faith, but as probable by the vast majority of sober Christian writers in all ages. The fact that Mary was Theotokos, and the incident beneath the Cross when our Lord, who enjoined and respected the duties of human relationship, committed His Mother to the keeping of St. John, make the Helvidian view at least exceedingly improbable. But Professor Gould's 'inter-confessional' comment is that 'there is no more baseless, nor, for that matter, prejudiced theory, in the whole range of Biblical study, than that which makes Jesus the only child of Mary' (p. 104). If we put a few other references beside this extract we shall see what freedom from ecclesiastical bias means. Twice we are told that 'first-born' in St. Luke ii. 7 implies that Mary had other sons (pp. 58, 104). It is admitted (p. 57) that ἀδελφοί is used sometimes to denote less intimate relationship, but it is added that the supposition that it means anything else than brothers in connection with our Lord's relatives is 'quite against the evidence.' Yet on p. 61 we are told that οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ 'would denote those descended from him, but it has come to have this modification of its strict meaning.' Lastly, this unbiassed writer, in discussing the second Mary in xv. 40, sets aside the conjecture that she was the sister of the Lord's Mother, because, among other reasons, it is connected with the theory that ἀδελφοί means cousins, and 'this theory has against it the fact that it is in the interest of the dogma of the perpetual virginity 'which we are discussing' (p. 296).¹ Our next observation will embrace a vast number of passages scattered throughout the commentary, and covers a wide field. It is that Professor Gould frequently—we might almost say, usually—speaks of our Lord as those writers do who regard His Godhead as, to say the least, an open question. Some of the more striking instances may be mentioned. Professor Gould says that our Lord 'was forced' into opposition to the ruling sect of the Jews (Intro. p. xiv), and that 'His possession of a divine power He shared with other men, but His divine use of that power is His own; He shares it with no one' (*ibid.* p. xxiv). He had, we are told, 'His scruples,' which could be overcome by faith (*ibid.*), and He is said to have been 'careless of everything else' but to conquer for Himself the love and obedience of all men (*ibid.* p. xxvi). The phrase 'the Son of God' is to be understood in a titular sense, according to Professor Gould, and if we suggest any meaning of metaphysical sonship the *onus probandi* is on us (pp. 4, 12, 38, 56). Our Lord is 'mightier than John by reason of His baptizing in the Holy Spirit' (p. 8), and we are to be protected from reading too

¹ To the references given in Bright's *S. Leo*, p. 136, note 9, we may add S. Ath. *C. Apoll.* i. 4; St. Aug. *De Fide et Symb.* 11, and *Ad Catech.* 6; Hooker, *Ecc. Pol.* II. vii. 5; Salmon, *Intro. to N. T.* p. 597; Lightfoot's *Galatians*, Dissertation II.; Sadler's *St. Mark*, Excursus II. p. 428. Maclellan (*New Test.* p. 654) gives the facts, but draws the Helvidian conclusion. Keble refers to the perpetual virginity in his poem for Easter Day in *Lyra Innocentium*. Comp. Bp. Bull's *Engl. Theol. Works*, p. 71, and Jer. Taylor's *Life of Christ*, § 3.

much a
look fo
teachin
of our
attacks
on whic
account
crete st
In one
situatio
manifes
knowle
saved
facts (
growth
by Jes
'agenc
... a
Jesus i
seman
best in
these,
of all v
of the
are ser
comme
Bridg
our L
(p. 58)
(p. 16)
Adven
tinker
the cop
that 't
the Su
implied
passag
days (p
(p. xxv
Surely
the so
the E
where
liaritie
much
fidelity

much even into this comparison by the caution that 'we are not to look for Christian terms, nor Christian uses of terms, in John's teaching' (p. 9). Then, of course, 'the historicity' (a favourite word of our author, cf. pp. xliii, 34) 'of the account of the temptation is attacked with some plausibility. There are certain things about it on which a just historical criticism throws some doubt.' But 'the account which has been preserved is evidently the pictorial and concrete story of what really took place within the soul of Jesus' (p. 14). In one passage our Lord is spoken of as 'not at all satisfied with the situation created by His sudden popularity' (p. 34), in another as manifesting 'a distinctly human change of purpose, such as foreknowledge would have prevented' (p. 117), and in another as being saved 'from an immoral sentimentality' by insisting on material facts (p. 185). Again, we are told that 'human goodness is a growth . . . and it was this human goodness which was possessed by Jesus' (p. 190). The Word, the Spirit, and the Christ are 'agencies charged with spiritual power' (p. 194), and 'inspiration . . . accounts for whatever extraordinary knowledge belonged to Jesus in His early life' (p. 236). The agony in the Garden of Gethsemane 'was one of those sacred things in a man's life, in which his best instincts bid him be alone' (p. 268). To such passages as these, which we suppose will for the most part jar upon the minds of all who have not substituted psilanthropism for the Catholic faith of the Incarnation, we must add many others on divers topics which are seriously inadequate and unsatisfactory. Among these are the comments on our Lord's death (Introd. pp. xxx-ii), the title of the Bridegroom (p. 45), the reading of Abiathar (p. 49), the relation of our Lord to the Sabbath (p. 50), the explanations of Boanerges (p. 58) and 'mystery' (p. 71), the significance of the Transfiguration (p. 161), the quotation of Ps. cx. (p. 235), the view of the second Advent in the New Testament (p. 241), the cheap fling at theological tinkering upon St. Mark, xiii. 32 (p. 254), the quibble on the meaning of the copula in the words of institution (p. 264), and the queer assertion that 'the Gospels do not give us any command for the repetition of the Supper, nor for its continuance as a Church institution. That is implied in 1 Cor. xi. 25' (p. 265). Another class of unsatisfactory passages depreciates the value of fasting according to rule, or on set days (pp. xxii, 46), or ceremonialism (p. xxiv), or Church organization (p. xxvi), or the Christian hierarchy (p. xxviii), or the Creeds (p. 48). Surely we have produced enough evidence to show that this is not the sort of commentary which we can recommend to the clergy of the English Church. There are other and better commentaries where the synoptic problem, and the Lord's miracles, and the peculiarities of St. Mark's closing verses can be studied with the aid of as much scholarship as Professor Gould displays, and with far more fidelity to the Gospel portrait of the Incarnate Lord.

The Conditions of our Lord's Life on Earth. Being Five Lectures delivered on the Bishop Paddock Foundation, in the General Seminary of New York, 1896. To which is prefixed Part of a First Professorial Lecture at Cambridge. By ARTHUR JAMES MASON, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge; Canon of St. Saviour's, Canterbury. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896.)

THE introductory lecture prefixed to this volume was delivered by Dr. Mason at Cambridge in January 1896, on his entering upon his duties as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity. The main object of it was to urge what he believes to be 'one of the chief requirements of the time, and indeed of all times—the continued re-investigation of the New Testament for the purposes of Dogmatic Theology' (Preface, p. xxii). Having this object, it is fittingly placed as an introduction to the five lectures delivered in New York a little later, on the invitation of the trustees of the Paddock Lecture Fund, since the treatment of parts of the doctrine of the Incarnation adopted in them is based almost entirely on the study of the Gospels. The last three of these five lectures were also 'in substance delivered to the clergy of Worcester and the neighbourhood, in the chapter-house of that Cathedral, in 1892 and 1895, and to the summer gathering of clergy at Cambridge in 1894' (Preface, p. ix).

We have said that the treatment of doctrine in this volume is based almost entirely on the study of the Gospels. There are a few references to the Epistles, and Dr. Mason is careful to explain that he does not think the Gospels can be profitably studied as sources of dogmatic truth except from the standpoint of the theology of the four great Councils.

'The definitions of Nicæa and Chalcedon,' he says, 'are binding upon us, not only because we have consented to be bound by them under peril of ejection from the Church, but also because the more we work upon the materials at our command, the more abundantly clear it becomes that no theory of the Person of our Redeemer answers to the facts except the theory of the Fathers—two whole and perfect natures co-existing and united in the single and indivisible person of the Son of God made flesh' (p. 31).

And again:

'In preaching Christ, we need to return to that which is simple, moving, life-like. Only we must beware that in coming back to the Gospels we come back without losing or forgetting what we have learned from the Apostolic Epistles and from the Fathers. It would be a grievous mistake if we hoped to learn better the lesson of the Gospels by beginning, as the first disciples did, with everything yet to find out' (p. 35).

This insistence on the need of the continual study of the Gospels and of regard for the œcumenical decisions of the Church is valuable. To those who believe in Inspiration it is an obvious truth that Holy Scripture was designed to be ever shedding fresh light on those who study it in the right spirit. That spirit necessarily in-

cludes affirm

Yet exegesi lines of individ imperfe it too oppose that h many a somew justice the co contain

The what w is the which

'It modern Divine nature acting from ti His hu human

We Dr. M thus d exhibit 'He ir more Dr. M 'facts' lecture His D

'To languag earth in nate S refusin own a

¹ S Cyril v regard ² S to on p the wo those v

cludes submission to all that the Universal Church has dogmatically affirmed.

Yet we cannot altogether agree with Dr. Mason's methods of exegesis. He seems to us to shake himself too free of the general lines of Catholic thought. Holding as we do that no opinion of an individual teacher can bind Christians, and that there were many imperfections in the mediæval theologians, we yet think he regards it too lightly that 'the *animus* of Cyril's theology in general is opposed to the line' which he himself takes (Preface, p. xvi), and that he abandons 'the prevailing tone of Christian thought' for many centuries (p. 33). That in taking up such a position he somewhat misunderstands St. Cyril,¹ and does not altogether do justice to the mediæval theology,² is less our present concern than the consideration of the teaching which this volume of lectures contains.

The lecture entitled 'Our Lord's power upon Earth' will illustrate what we mean. The task which Dr. Mason there sets before himself is the examination, in the light of Holy Scripture, of a position which he thus describes :

'It is often assumed, and not unnaturally, both by ancient and by modern writers, that in His miracles our Saviour was exercising His Divine power, and in His sufferings the weakness of the creaturely nature which He had vouchsafed to assume. He was thus alternately acting in two capacities, if I may use such an expression. He interrupted from time to time the exhibition of His Divine energy, in order to give His humanity its turn ; or He interrupted the normal homeliness of a human life by wondrous vindications of His Godhead' (pp. 84-5).

We do not think that many of those who hold the belief of which Dr. Mason here speaks would choose the language by which he thus describes it, and especially the phrases 'He interrupted' 'the exhibition of His Divine energy,' 'to give His humanity its turn,' 'He interrupted the normal homeliness of a human life.' But it is of more importance to observe his conclusions on the subject. Dr. Mason, indeed, says that it is his business rather to 'collect' 'facts' than to 'form theories' (p. 111), but the whole tone of the lecture is against the supposition that our Lord in His miracles used His Divine power, and the lecturer says at the end of it :

'To my mind it is more attractive, as well as more loyal to the language of the Gospels, instead of supposing Christ to have walked the earth in constant exercise of His own Divine powers, to think of the Incarnate Son as undergoing for our sake the double self-sacrifice—not only refusing, as has been often said, to use His Divine Omnipotence for His own advantage, but also refusing to use it even for ours—preferring

¹ See, e.g., *De fest. pasch. Hom.* xvii. for teaching that shows that St. Cyril was not unsensitive 'to the consecrated language of Scripture with regard to our Lord's Humanity' (Preface, p. xvii).

² Such statements as that there was not 'faith' in our Lord (referred to on p. 68) need to be regarded in the light of the exact sense in which the words are used, and in relation to the general system of thought of those who make them.

rather to work out our restoration by the toilsome and far-reaching exertions and sufferings of His human body and soul and spirit, in reliance upon Another who is our Father and His Father, His God as well as our God.

'Indeed, if we are to look anywhere in the Incarnate life for a display of the forces of Christ's Divine Personality, perhaps we may rightly look for it in the very opposite direction from that in which Christians have often looked. Instead of looking at His mighty deeds, perhaps we should think rather of His mighty sufferings' (pp. 111-2).

Now, it is certainly true that in His miracles our Lord used His human mind, and His human voice, and the touch of His human flesh. It is reasonable to suppose that the miracles demanded a great effort of His human spirit. It is recorded that one effect of the gift of the Holy Ghost to His humanity was carried out in these mighty works.¹ But there is nothing inconsistent with all this in His Divine Person having used His Manhood as its instrument whereby the great deeds should be done. And when St. John says that the 'signs' accomplished by Jesus are proofs that He 'is the Christ, the Son of God,'² it is, at least, as natural to understand him to mean that they are indications of His Divinity as to interpret the phrase 'Son of God' in one of its secondary senses.³ In such a state of the Scriptural evidence, it seems to us to be simply ignoring the Providence of God in guiding Christian thought within the Catholic Church to put aside the emphatic teaching of many Fathers. The clear utterances of St. Athanasius⁴ and St. Leo⁵ were typical of a continuous line of thought which found one of its best examples in the magnificent sermon of St. Proclus,⁶ a line of thought which may be expressed by saying that the one Person of the Eternal Word in His incarnate life on earth restrained His Divine powers, so that He might suffer and die in His own humanity, and used them so that men might be blessed.

Another lecture is on the 'appearances of limitation' in 'our Lord's knowledge upon earth.' In considering it we are met by what at first sight appears to be an inconsistency. Dr. Mason says definitely that it is our Lord's human knowledge which he is examining:

'This may be premised—namely, that all Christ's knowledge, as conveyed to us in the Gospel teaching, was, in its form, human knowledge, not Divine. This may sound strange; but it will be easier to grasp if we distinguish clearly between the source of His knowledge and its form. Before knowledge which was Divine in its origin could come through Him to us, it must needs be translated into human knowledge, by passing through His human mind, expressed by His human lips in human language. If, during His life on earth, He had a Divine form of knowledge along with a human form, such Divine form of knowledge must be beyond our powers of discernment. The knowledge which is available for us may be Divine in its origin, but is human in its form.

'We are then to consider what is told us concerning this human knowledge of the Incarnate Word' (p. 118).

¹ St. Matt. xii. 28.

² Cf. with this passage Rom. i. 4.

³ E.g. *Ep.* xxviii. 4.

⁴ St. John xx. 30, 31.

⁵ *E.g. Orat. c. Ar.* iii. 32.

⁶ *Orat.* i., see especially §§ 9-10.

He implies also that the Divine knowledge of God the Son is complete and infinite :

'It is plain that whatever the Father knows, the Son knows also—and that of necessity no less than of choice' (p. 125).

He seems to have no doubt that our Lord's human knowledge was in some matters limited and incomplete. It would appear from these points, taken by themselves, to follow that in his view there were simultaneously existing in Christ two spheres of knowledge, His Divine knowledge and His human knowledge. Yet this position is apparently rejected when Dr. Mason says that 'the language of the Bible' 'does not suggest the notion of some other all-embracing form of knowledge held simultaneously in reserve' (p. 129), and quotes, we think with approval, the statement of Bishop O'Brien :

'When it is said that at one and the same time He knew . . . as the Word, but was ignorant . . . as Man; or that while He knew . . . as regarded His Divine Nature, He was ignorant . . . as regarded His Human Nature; or that His Divine Nature knew . . . but His Human Nature was ignorant . . . we are in reality, though not in words, supposing Him to be made up of two Persons' (p. 117, note ¹).

If, then, the Divine knowledge of God the Son is in itself complete and infinite, and the human knowledge of Christ was limited and incomplete, and there were not two co-ordinate spheres of knowledge in the Incarnate Lord during His life on earth, there appears to be no other solution than that the theory hinted at by the use of the word 'if' in the sentence 'If, during His life on earth, He had a Divine form of knowledge' (p. 118), is actually held by Dr. Mason—namely, the theory that in the Incarnation the Son of God surrendered His Divine knowledge, at least so far as the sphere of His incarnate life was concerned. That this is the right solution of the apparent inconsistency in Dr. Mason's teaching appears to be confirmed by the statement that, while he does not 'suggest that the Godhead in Christ became passible,' 'the doctrine that Godhead must be incapable of suffering is more a doctrine of the philosophers than of the Bible' (pp. 112-13); and the quotation in the Preface asserting that change in the Divine Person of the Word is both possible in the abstract and taught in the Holy Scripture :

'Some think . . . that we cannot adopt any interpretation of the Lord's words which would represent Him as having undergone anything beyond an outward or relative change in taking our nature. From the impossibility of conceiving any change in the Infinite they seem to have inferred, if they did not confound the two things, that any such change is impossible. But, however safely we may hold that it is impossible that any such change can take place through any other agency, it would seem very rash and presumptuous to deny the possibility of its being effected by the will of the Infinite Being Himself. I should say this supposing that we had no way of arriving at any conclusion on the

¹ Quoted from O'Brien, *A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the United Dioceses of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin, at his Ordinary Visitation in October 1863*, p. 104. We are not acquainted with this Charge, except from Dr. Mason's quotations.

question but the high *priori* road. But we have a much safer, though a humbler, way. . . . Where the Infinite is concerned we can rely but little upon any collection of our own reason, unless it be confirmed by Revelation. Here, however, there is no want of such confirmation, nor can we, I think, read the Holy Scriptures fairly without finding it' (Preface, pp. xx-xxi).¹

If our inference is correct, Dr. Mason regards the Eternal Word as having actually given up His Divine knowledge when He became incarnate, an opinion which has many points of contact with the view that He did not exercise His own Divine power in His miraculous works.

Against this notion of the abandonment of Divine knowledge by God the Son we renew the protest we have many times in late years had occasion to make. Itself an illustration of the disregard for Catholic tradition, of which we have already written, it is, we cannot but think, perilous to the fundamental idea of the Incarnation, to the doctrine of the Atonement, and to the truth of the essential Being of God.

We ourselves see difficulties in the way of extending the ignorance of the human mind of Christ beyond those matters which are the province of Deity alone,² in the recognition of which some who in the main agree with us do not altogether share. That question is a very small matter compared with those which concern the Divine Nature itself.

There are smaller points in which we think Dr. Mason's work open to criticism.³ There are many valuable features which it contains. It shows marks of industrious study and much reverent thought. It protests effectively against teaching which suggests the possibility of mistakes in Christ's words (p. 29). It explains clearly the impossibility of the Divine Person of Christ assuming sinful nature (pp. 52-4). It asserts the truth of the conception of our Lord by a Virgin Mother (pp. 54-7). It emphasizes the fallacy of supposing that Christ could have yielded to temptation (pp. 64-6).

¹ Quoted from O'Brien, *ibid.* p. 104.

² Hooker, in speaking of the human soul of Christ, used the words 'which being so inward unto God cannot choose but be privy unto all things which God worketh, and must therefore of necessity be endued with knowledge so far forth universal, though not with infinite knowledge peculiar to Deity itself.' *Ecclesiastical Polity*, v. liv. 7.

³ The following are instances of what we mean. He speaks as if the gift of the Holy Spirit recorded in the Gospels was to the Deity as well as to the Humanity of Christ (Pref. pp. xv-xvi, p. 193). In insisting on applying the phrase 'a man' to our Lord, he does not seem to see that the objection to it lies in the ambiguity of the word 'a' (pp. 28, 29, 30, 45-8). He apparently misunderstands St. Hilary, *De Trin.* viii. 45 (p. 32), through not observing that 'forma' was sometimes used by that Father in the sense of 'habitus,' as may be seen by comparing the earlier part of the same section; cf. also *De Trin.* ix. 14; and see Bright, *The Incarnation as a Motive Power*, p. 291, note¹ (edition 2). He seems to us to discuss unnecessarily the question of the physical method of Christ's Birth (pp. 56-7).

From
Lord a

In
make
that hi
them,
be unc
and th
though
an occ
the mo
greate
Christ'
that h
lecture
consid
wether
metho
the mo
teacher
chair in

Creation

COMPR
able siz
in the
should
ject ca
this sh
dang
and the
interest
these s
there is
not des
he has
reaction
fascina
notices
length
in scien
When
revelati
nature
of the v
externa
thoroug
the wor
cess in

From beginning to end it is full of a strong sense of belief in our Lord as the centre of life and thought.

In view of so much that is admirable in this book, we venture to make an appeal to its distinguished author. He tells us himself that his lectures gave rise to 'misgivings' among those who heard them, that some who only knew the lectures by report supposed it to be uncertain whether he 'believed in the Godhead of Christ or not,' and that 'a respected English priest' now working in America thought that some part of his teaching fell under the anathema of an œcumenical council (Pref. pp. x, xi). We ourselves, possessing the most intense conviction of the necessity of maintaining with the greatest clearness and strength the reality and completeness of Christ's humanity, have formed an unfavourable estimate of much that he says. In the face of these various impressions which the lectures have made, is it too much to ask Dr. Mason if he will reconsider, with the learning and insight he has so readily at command, whether the ideas here expressed are all true, and whether his methods of expression are uniformly wise? We make the appeal the more earnestly because of the responsibility which attaches to a teacher personally able to attract and influence who fills a theological chair in one of our great Universities.

Creation Centred in Christ. By H. G. GUINNESS, D.D., F.R.A.S. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.)

COMPREHENSIVE ideas no doubt lead naturally to books of considerable size, but Dr. Guinness has allowed himself immoderate freedom in the compilation of this huge volume. He may plead, and we should frankly admit the justice of the plea, that no conceivable subject can be named which is excluded by the terms of his title. But this should have been a warning to the author to beware of the dangers of undue amplification, excessive oratorical embellishments, and the superfluous introduction of personal incidents, of however interesting a kind. Dr. Guinness's enthusiasm has led him into all these snares, and yet, if the reader will take the book as he finds it, there is abundant material for instruction and enjoyment. We must not describe in detail all the subjects on which he discourses. When he has observed that we now appear to be passing into a period of reaction against various forms of scepticism he is allured by the fascination of the subject into almost innumerable bypaths. He notices and criticizes and very nearly goes in some cases to the length of reviewing the articles and books which illustrate the theme, in science, Biblical criticism, and archæology (Intro. pp. ix-xxix). When he is about to trace the connexion between nature and revelation he is impelled to inquire not only into the witness of nature to God, but into all the possible views of men on the origin of the universe (pp. 3-7); and then into the need and the evidences, external and internal, of revelation (pp. 15-45). We then in a very thorough but rather laboured fashion get introduced to the main part of the work. Dr. Guinness traces the operation of a centralizing process in nature and in revelation (pp. 49-95), and in the relation

between them (p. 98 to the end of the book). It is here that the individuality of Dr. Guinness's work appears. He not only applies with extraordinary fulness and detail the Butlerian principle of analogy (pp. 98-163), but lays great stress upon adjustment or adaptation, which has not, he considers, received the recognition it deserves. In the illustration of the law of adjustment Dr. Guinness makes use of geology (p. 178), history (p. 241), and above all of astronomy and chronology (p. 257). Astronomy is pressed into the service as an unimpeachable witness which testifies that 'the movements of worlds have been ordered in harmony with the revealed chronology of Redemption history' (Introd. p. xxix). Dr. Guinness's studies led him to think that the course of solar years and lunar months for thousands of years could be deduced from the 'prophetic times' in the Book of Daniel (*ibid.* p. xxxii), and he presents us with the very elaborate results of his investigations, verifying his suppositions, to his own immense delight, and apparently to the satisfaction of some eminent astronomers (*ibid.* p. xxxiv). He tabulates the principal conclusions to which he has been led (*ibid.* pp. xxxiv-v), and we do not require to be astronomical experts to understand a moderately large part of the sections upon the use of number in the Bible (p. 257), the Levitical and prophetic 'times' (pp. 272, 277, 324), the scientific basis of the chronology of the four empires (p. 292), the chronology of our Lord's Passion (pp. 299, 331), and 'the times of the Gentiles' (p. 351). But the whole discussion is so vast that we are conscious as we read of wondering where we are, just as we feel when we embark upon any inquiry about the fourth dimension. And when we were reading what Dr. Guinness had to say about the symbolic use of number in Holy Scripture we could not help recalling the sensation of amazement with which we used to listen a good many years ago to the remarkable lectures of Professor H. J. S. Smith on the theory of numbers, which he was delivering at the time of his death. This volume is not numbered volume i., and therefore we are slightly puzzled by an allusion to volume ii. (pp. xi, 505). But, in spite of ponderous expansion and excessive ramification, the drift of the book is clear enough—that nature is the work, and Scripture the word, of God; and that nature is centred in the system of things set forth in Scripture, which in its turn is centred in Christ (p. 436).

Studies in Judaism. By S. SCHECHTER, M.A., Reader in Talmudic in the University of Cambridge. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896.)

WE do not forget the wide range of studies of many Old Testament scholars when we say that Mr. Schechter's essays in this volume will open some new fields to almost all Biblical students. With the exception of an introductory essay, which explains what is meant by 'the high synagogue,' and mentions some historical anticipations of higher criticism among Jewish writers, all the studies appeared in their original form in the *Jewish Quarterly* and the *Jewish Chronicle*. The first three essays, on the Chassidim, Krochmal, and the Gaon,

bringing
Easter
display
accoun
terms
more
exten
the hi
are sa
that a
words
tian to
withi
manif
that t
expect
A fur
tion i
(p. 28
schola
Hebre
books
are es
more
Jewis
Pende
(p. 38
book
life of
sprang
first m

A His
T
T
a

PROF
lation
as the
find in
conser
data.
history
charac
Profes

1 C
on the
the Je
Mr. A
(Macn

bring to our notice a type of men produced by the synagogue of the Eastern Jews. In the essay on Nachmanides (p. 120) Judaism is displayed from the side of emotion and feeling, and in the brief account of Rabbi Solomon of St. Goar we have what Mr. Schechter terms 'a Jewish Boswell' (p. 173). 'The dogmas of Judaism' is a more substantial essay of a theological nature, as indeed to some extent are at least seven of the other essays in the volume; and here the highest motives which worked through the history of Judaism are said to be the strong belief in God and the unshaken confidence that at last this God will be the God of the whole world—in other words, faith and hope (p. 179). It is obvious upon this for a Christian to remark that it is by the revelation of love, as eternally existing within the being of the one God, Father, Son, and Spirit, and as manifested in the Incarnation and Atoning Sacrifice of the Cross, that this God has shown Himself to be, what the Jews believed and expected that He would be acknowledged to be, the universal Lord. A further doctrinal paper is that upon the treatment of divine retribution in rabbinical literature (p. 259). 'The law and recent criticism' (p. 283) is chiefly an examination of the historical work of a Harvard scholar, Professor Toy. The history of Jewish tradition (p. 222), the Hebrew collection of the British Museum (p. 306), the titles of Jewish books (p. 328), and the earliest Jewish community in Europe (p. 397) are essays which the scholar will find full of interesting matter. For more general readers we recommend the papers on 'the child in Jewish literature,' curiously opened with an apposite quotation from *Pendennis* (p. 342), and on 'Woman in temple and synagogue' (p. 381). Short notes and a sufficiently detailed index complete a book of uncommon interest, frequently casting a side-light upon the life of the nation from which our Lord, as concerning the flesh, sprang, among whom He lived, and to whom His offer of mercy was first made.¹

A History of the Hebrews. By R. KITTEL, Ordinary Professor of Theology in the University of Breslau. In two volumes. Vol. I. Translated by John Taylor, D.Lit., M.A. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1895.)

PROFESSOR CHEYNE, as one of the editors of the Theological Translation Library, explains why Professor Kittel's work has been selected as the first in the series to deal with the Old Testament. We are to find in it, he tells us, deliberateness of procedure and comparative conservatism in conclusions combined with attention to archaeological data. It is not an undisturbed narrative of the outer and inner history of the Israelitish people, but a discussion of the limits and character of the sources of the history, and of the inferences which Professor Kittel draws from them, 'carried on with an earnest desire

¹ On Jewish Church History see *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 6; on their conversion, *ibid.* No. 51; on Graetz's *History*, *ibid.* No. 69; on the Jew in fiction, *ibid.* No. 74. On Jewish mediæval social life see Mr. Abrahams's recently published *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages* (Macmillan).

not to deviate more than is absolutely necessary from tradition, but yet widely differing in important respects from the position which Professor Kuenen had reached in 1889.' So far Professor Cheyne (Editor's Pref. pp. v-vi; cf. p. 126). Professor Kittel has himself supplied a preface to the English translation, and has made several additions in the body of the work; but yet he confesses that the first volume, which is all that is now before us, represents the position of affairs six years ago rather than that of to-day. And that is quite a long period, we may observe, in the ever-shifting position of modern critics. The aim of the whole work, in the author's view, which is not quite in verbal agreement with Professor Cheyne's account of it, is to give 'the history of the ancient Hebrew people from their first beginnings up to the time when, first in Babylonia and then in Palestine, they pass over into the small community of Judaism' (Pref. p. viii). Upon the presumption that an English translation is not intended for those who are German scholars we cannot see why A.T. should be adopted as the abbreviation for the Old Testament, or that the foot notes should be incessantly crowded with references to German books, whether they have been translated or not. The conquest of Canaan is the term of this first volume, which, after an introduction on existing books and the features and population of Canaan, is divided into a treatise upon the sources of information (p. 27) and the history of the period (p. 136). Dr. Kittel's materials upon the sources of information largely consist of an account of the various steps by which certain German critics abandoned the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, adopted the term Hexateuch for the first six books of the Holy Scripture, and proceeded to dissect the whole into portions labelled D and J and E and P, and so on almost indefinitely. It is obvious that this mode of treatment must annually produce a bulkier narrative. There is no sign of finality to be detected in the output of critical hypotheses, and, although we are ready enough to confess that Dr. Kittel has given us a succinct account of many ingenious imaginations, we cannot say that we derive much profit from the story, or that he really helps us to understand why God has been pleased to deliver the inspired books to us in the form in which we now have them. Yet the present form and the inner meaning of the divine message seems to us to include many matters of moral and spiritual as well as of intellectual life, of much more importance than the fancy anatomy of narrow critical investigation. In dealing with the history of the period Dr. Kittel takes first the patriarchal age (p. 136), then Moses and the desert journey (p. 192), and lastly the conquest of Canaan (p. 264). If the reader wants to find out what Holy Scripture says about Abraham, or Isaac, or Jacob, or Joseph, let him not expect to find all the information in one place. He must pursue his search under an E section, and then under a J section, and then perhaps under some third head, finding nothing after all to approach the full Christian significance of the Old Testament biography. He will know, of course, that 'in Vetere Testamento

Now
own v
which
discus
sourc
does,
cess v
the n
whole
and v
the C
it see
in the
takes
and s
garne

Edwa
bi
a

Dr. T
Vicar
is not
influe
that C
value,
influe
to vis
learn
mann
with l
all ho
Societ
the C
in so
whose
of a
which
shoul
wond
days
his ca
was,
of th
best
his o
differ
in thi

Novum latet,¹ but if he has been taking the modern critics at their own value he will experience a shock when he realizes that meanings which 'lie hidden' escape the notice of shallow scholarship. To discuss under each division of the history 'the tradition in the sources,' and then 'the historical substance of the story,' as Dr. Kittel does, is much more than inadequate. It is a scattering, rending process which destroys the harmonious relation of the various parts of the narrative to each other, and prevents us from studying it as a whole. So far as our impression of the work is concerned then, and viewing Holy Scripture as the volume which our spiritual mother the Church has put into her children's hands for Christian purposes, it seems to us that Dr. Kittel has piled up a vast amount of lumber in the porch of the temple of inspiration, while tradition at least takes us inside. Dr. Kittel and his friends would clothe us in rags and shreds, but tradition at all events offers us the shelter of a garment.

Edward Hoare, M.A. A record of his life based upon a brief autobiography. Edited by the Rev. J. H. TOWNSEND, D.D. With a portrait. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.)

DR. TOWNSEND has very wisely listened to the desires of his former Vicar's family and has kept this volume within reasonable limits. It is not as a doughty champion of the Evangelical party, or as an influential leader in the councils of the Church Missionary Society that Canon Hoare's biography is to us so interesting. We greatly value, in the first place, the testimony of the book to the previous influence of good parents. Once a week his father used habitually to visit the schoolroom and hear his children repeat what they had learned; and his mother, beautiful in countenance, gentle in her manners, pure in her thoughts, and most loving in all her intercourse with her family, exercised a most sacred and refining influence over all her children. Both the parents had been brought up in the Society of Friends, but the children were all educated as members of the Church of England. Such parental efforts to train up children in sound principles of religion ought to be pressed upon parents whose lot is cast in days of easy toleration. Another point of value, of a different kind, is to be observed in the picture of Church life which is given in the earlier part of the Memoir. It is well that we should see what a condition of things the Church of England has so wondrously survived. We read how the Bishop of Norwich in those days was too infirm to undertake his own ordinations, and therefore sent his candidates to the Bishop of Lincoln at Buckden. Canon Hoare was, of course, no sacerdotalist, and was vigorously opposed to some of the principles which are somehow associated with several of the best theological colleges. But when he recalls the circumstances of his own examination for the sacred ministry, he is impressed with the difference between that and the present careful pains of our Bishops in this respect. There is doubtless an improvement; but the truest

¹ 'S. Aug. *Quest. lxxiii in Exod.*; cf. *Epist. 132*, and *In Psalm. xcvi.*

friends of the Church of England are those who urge that much, especially in the early stages of the sifting process, remains yet to be done. We may be thankful once again that the days when there used to be 'a good deal of jobbery' about such plural holdings as Canon Hoare describes on p. 71, have passed away, although if the present decrease of income goes on we may not see how some return to the position of the pluralists can be avoided. At all events we shall never return to the state of affairs when a young clergyman was publicly presented to the Archdeacon because he had been guilty of giving a Wednesday-evening lecture in the infant schoolroom. The Archdeacon (Samuel Wilberforce) said that it was a grave matter, and must be referred to the Bishop, who was so alarmed at infringements of the Act of Uniformity, although he approved of the lecture, that Mr. Hoare thought it was best to give it up. But of course the most important part of Canon Hoare's life centred in Tunbridge Wells. His zeal for the Church Missionary Society, his parochial work and his co-operation with his young colleagues (of whom his present biographer was one), his great gifts as a preacher, and his vigorous platform speeches at Church Congresses and other gatherings, fill the later part of the book. We must not make any further reference to details beyond giving ourselves the pleasure of noticing that at the Church Congress at Derby in 1882 Mr. Beresford Hope was apparently too much for the great Evangelical champion. 'Hope,' he says, 'was very bad, but did not give much that I could lay hold on.' The tributes at the close of the volume show how accurately our esteemed contemporary the *Guardian* reflected Church opinion at large when it opened an 'in memoriam' notice with a paragraph which said that long before Canon Hoare's death 'experience and advancing years had so suffused his views with Catholicity that he was even more conspicuous as a pillar of his Church than as the leader of a party' (quoted on p. 270).

Wholesome Words. Sermons on some important points of Christian doctrine preached before the University of Oxford. By Rev. C. A. HEURTLEY, D.D., late Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Edited with a Prefatory Memoir of the Author by Rev. WILLIAM INCE, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896.)

For fifty years Dr. Heurtley never declined any of his official preaching turns, and it appears that during that period he preached sixty-one times before the University of Oxford. Dr. Ince tells us that his brother Canon bestowed the most anxious care upon the preparation of these official sermons, and yet there are various reasons why we are more interested in the personal memoir of the preacher than in the sermons which have been selected as a sample of his teaching. Certainly the subjects of the discourses are not in themselves unimportant. Dr. Heurtley followed the good, old-fashioned plan of choosing great subjects for his sermons, such as

The
and A
are tw
author
be ren
tried
Eucha
is mo
The s
1859
gelica
topics
parties
days a
years,
minist
where
done
Heurt
lectur
66).
the p
excess
and t
which
theolo
preach
which
strife
charm
Ince's
his d
journ
occup
of hi
Engli
entire
inter
theolo
and v
perso
justic
ness
which
the p
Order
acad
given
portra

The Atonement, Faith, Baptism, The Holy Eucharist, Confession and Absolution, and Modern Criticism. On the Holy Eucharist there are two sermons preached in 1857 and 1868, and also a passage in the author's preface written in 1895, only six weeks before his death. It will be remembered that Dr. Heurtley was one of the three assessors who tried Archdeacon Denison in 1856 on a charge of erroneous Eucharistic teaching, and the point of view which the preacher takes is more suited to the circumstances of 1856 than to the present day. The same is true, even perhaps more true, of the sermon preached in 1859 on Confession and Absolution. As a mild but steady Evangelical of the old school, Dr. Heurtley's mode of discussing these topics is as much out of touch with the modern position of nearly all parties as Wheatley's innocent description of the black-letter saints' days as Romish. The increased study of ancient liturgies in recent years, and the clearer views of the primitive aspects of the Christian ministry which now prevail, have carried us on far from the ground where Dr. Heurtley so consistently stood. Much has also been done to settle the controversy about Justification on which Dr. Heurtley preached the Bampton Lectures in 1845. Two of the lectures are abridged and placed as sermons in this volume (pp. 43, 66). There are aspects of the doctrine of the Atonement on which the preachers of Dr. Heurtley's day were wont to dwell perhaps excessively, and which are nowadays certainly too much neglected, and the sermon on this doctrine, the first in the volume, is one which we should be glad to put into the hands of many modern theologians. And the patient tone of the sermon on modern criticism, preached in 1890, is quite in harmony with the steadying advice which this Review has always attempted to give in the face of the strife of tongues of contending critics. Yet, on the whole, the real charm of this virtually memorial volume is the picture which Dr. Ince's memoir gives of Dr. Heurtley himself, who was at the time of his decease the oldest resident member of the University. The journey up to Oxford in November 1823—of course by coach, and occupying from Louth to Oxford twenty-seven hours—the customs of his undergraduate days, the early lectures which he gave on English prose, describe conditions of academic life which have now entirely passed away, and which every Oxford man will read with interest. The difficult attempt to estimate Dr. Heurtley's exact theological position is made by Dr. Ince with marked success (p. lvi), and with sturdy and characteristic fairness. The few words on the personal character of Dr. Heurtley dwell too briefly, but with perfect justice, on the reality of his personal religion, the courteous gentleness of his timid, retiring disposition, the self-denying liberality which devoted one-seventh of his income to charitable purposes, and the proof which he gave that it is still possible for a man in Holy Orders to live a saintly life amid the secularizing influences of modern academical life. A list of Dr. Heurtley's principal publications is given (p. lxiv), but we regret that the book is not embellished with a portrait of the venerable professor.

The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. By EDWARD GIBBON. Edited in seven volumes, with introduction, notes, appendices, and index, by J. B. BURY, M.A., Hon. Litt.D. of Durham, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin, and Professor of Modern History in Dublin University. Vol. I. (London: Methuen and Co., 1896.)

MODERN readers demand books of convenient size with as much clearness of type and elegance of binding as possible, and Professor Bury has borne these requirements in mind in bringing out a new edition of Gibbon's work. And the care which he has bestowed upon exterior form is but the outward sign of the trouble which he has taken to make the present edition level with the times. At the beginning of this volume we have an excellent map of the Roman empire in 180 A.D., and the editor has wisely printed all the prefaces and 'advertisements' which Gibbon himself wrote for the various parts, editions, and notes of his work. In one of these, the preface to the fourth volume of the quarto edition, Gibbon takes the opportunity of explaining what his aim has been in the spelling of proper names. We must not quote the passage, but we may refer any readers to it who are inclined to cling too closely to original forms (p. xiv).¹ The introduction by the editor contains much good material. He has carefully collated the two editions of 1776 and 1782 throughout the first fourteen chapters, which comprise the contents of this volume, and he shows that Gibbon made some changes 'for the sake, not of correcting mis-statements of fact, but of improving the turn of a sentence, rearranging the dactyls and cretics, or securing greater accuracy of expression (p. xxxii). In other cases he put his statements into a less positive (p. xxxiii), or more vivid (p. xxxiv) form. The corrections and annotations made in Gibbon's own copy of the *Decline and Fall*, which was exhibited on the occasion of the Gibbon centenary, and is now preserved in the British Museum, are also included in Professor Bury's introduction (pp. xxxiv-viii). But the main purpose of this fairly comprehensive introduction is, not to show the care with which Gibbon polished the unique antithesis of his sentences, but to give a general idea of the respects in which his history may be described as behind date. The editor does this frankly, without forgetting that, in the main things, Gibbon 'is still our master, above and beyond date' (p. lxvii). He has been so successful in this delicate task that he will, we think, be found to have satisfied alike both the impartial student and the most eager admirer of Gibbon. The details which support the general statements of the introduction are frequently found in the notes and the appendices. The editor's short notes, enclosed in square brackets at the foot of the pages, bring many a note of Gibbon's into touch with modern knowledge, and the appendices achieve the same result upon a larger scale (pp. 443-64). The

¹ See also the excellent paper on Palæographic Purism in Mr. F. Harrison's *The Meaning of History*, p. 479. Mr. Harrison says much to help the young student of Gibbon in this book; see, for example, pp. 112-3.

subje
appen
policy
the cl
Rome
the o
tariff
is a s
the st
must
few ty
fesson
Gibbo
he ow
Tiller
'Gall
propo

1. L
2. H

BOTH
books
paroc
Blake
intro
ings
Godh
text.
bed a
book
many
and p
true i
find t
ways
hood,
future
berea
D
human
amini
concl
(p. 35
progr
natur
capac
conce
teach

subjects of the most importance which are thus discussed in appendices are Gibbon's authorities, the conquests of Trajan, the policy of Hadrian, the organization of the Roman army and navy, the changes in the Roman provinces, the constitutional history of Rome, and the significance of the principate of Septimius Severus, the origin of the Goths, the thirty tyrants, Zenobia, and Diocletian's tariff of maximum prices. We are glad to think that if this volume is a sample of those that are to follow, Professor Bury will encourage the study of Gibbon by producing a useful working edition. We must not yield to the strong temptation to conclude by extracting a few typical Gibbonian sentences from the immortal text which Professor Bury is editing, but we ought not to omit to say that while Gibbon's latest editor heartily admires him, he recognizes how much he owed to the amazing accuracy and the incomparable honesty of Tillemont (p. xliii). This is the more satisfactory in that Tillemont's 'Gallican' plainness of speech has prevented him from getting his proper award of praise from some modern Ultramontanes.

1. *Life's Shadows*. By the Rev. C. O. BLAKELOCK. (Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.)
2. *Holy Scripture*. By the Rev. T. S. BERRY, D.D. (Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.)

BOTH these small Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge books, which appear in a uniform binding, can be recommended to parochial clergymen who circulate books among their people. Mr. Blakelock derives his title from the Song of Solomon, iv. 6, and introduces his chapters to the reader by dwelling upon the sufferings of our Lord's human life, and the almighty power of His Godhead, as symbolized by the myrrh and the frankincense in the sacred text. Although there is much literature which is suitable for the sick bed and the sick room, Mr. Blakelock knows of 'no simple little book to put into the hands of those who are feeling acutely the many other sorrows of life' (p. 5). He writes therefore for these, and points to the Man of Sorrows, the Incarnate God, as the only true refuge for all the afflicted. There will only be few persons who find that they have not experienced sorrow in more than one of the ways described by Mr. Blakelock. There are the sorrows of childhood, the sorrows of little worries, disappointment, fear of the future, being misunderstood, poverty and care, sickness and pain, bereavement, spiritual trials, and the dread of death.

Dr. Berry treats his subject in a popular way, and traces the human, progressive, and divine elements in Holy Scripture by examining the general testimony of the different parts of the Bible. The conclusions which are drawn with respect to the human element (p. 39), are warranted by the facts, and are judiciously worded. The progressive element is examined as it appears in the revelation of the nature and being of God (p. 52), the adaptation of precepts to the capacities of each successive age (p. 61), the advance of man in the conception of moral duty (p. 64), and the increasing clearness of teaching upon the subject of immortality (p. 73). The divine element

in Holy Scripture means that the Bible is a record of the way in which God has made Himself known to man in the person of His Son, and Dr. Berry considers this divine revelation in its historical, typical, and prophetic aspects (pp. 96, 101, 112). Nor does he forget the special work of the Holy Spirit, for he concludes his excellent little treatise by some thoughts which lead us in the direction of the answer of the question, What is inspiration? (p. 122). As a rule those who cavil at the Bible are not very willing to study it seriously. But for those who have difficulties, and who are ready to make a patient effort to solve them, we can say that Dr. Berry's book is a very satisfactory manual.

The God-Man: being the 'Davies Lecture' for 1895. By T. C. EDWARDS, D.D., Principal of the Theological College, Bala; late Principal of the University College of Wales, Aberystwith. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895.)

THIS is the second lecture delivered in connexion with a trust founded in the year 1893 for an annual lecture by a minister of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists on one or other of a large number of subjects relating to religion. In its published form it is divided into three chapters, entitled 'The Incarnation and the Trinity,' 'The Incarnation and Human Nature,' 'The Incarnation and the Unity of Christ's Person.'

Dr. Edwards's work is to be welcomed as an indication of interest in and study of fundamental Christian truth. It is written in a clear and easy style; it contains much that is in harmony with the best Catholic theology. Consequently, it is likely to be of service in the religious body of which the author is a well-known member.

In spite of a good deal which we have read with great satisfaction, it is impossible for us to approve of the work as a whole, or to recommend it for the use of Churchmen. The language which the author uses with regard to what he calls the 'humanity' of God and the 'doctrine of the Logos as eternal Man' (pp. 12-18) is probably well meant, and intended to be expressive of an eternal capacity for the Incarnation in the Logos, and of the real existence of moral attributes in the Divine Nature. None the less, it appears to us to be dangerous in the extreme, as tending to obscure the distinctions between God and man; and we are not of opinion that this danger can be sufficiently guarded against by any explanations such as those given on pp. 17-18. It would have been better to avoid this unnecessary language altogether than to use it in the hope of escaping from its dangers by means of explaining it.

There are other points in which we think this little book open to serious objection. The most important of them have to do with the Person of our Lord and the 'kenosis.' Dr. Edwards rather strangely describes the belief of St. Athanasius about the Incarnate Word as an anticipation of Nestorianism (pp. 116-22); accepts the opinion of Luther, as taught by Dorner, of our Lord's Personality (pp. 141-150); and holds the view that in the Incarnation the eternal Word divested Himself of the 'form of God,' and, while retaining His

'mora
(pp. 1

It
teachi
meet
call f
Patris

The

T
P
I

BISHO
lamen
matt
Churc
Christ
of the
Amid
impor
instru
to th
Churc
that

'the C
as the
Divine
If she
at any
pline,
mand

O
shows
in the

'are p
except
would
omitte
teachi
date t
the A

H
Gosp

'A
with t
sump
of the
(as in
tion)
which
had b

'moral omnipotence,' laid His 'metaphysical omnipotence' aside (pp. 103-4, 126-38, 150-53).

It is less distressing to find marks of the evil influence of the teaching of the Lutheran divines in the works of Dissenters than to meet with them among Churchmen. Wherever they are found they call for the earnest protest of those who continue to hold the Patristic doctrine of the Incarnation.

The Church's Discipline concerning Marriage and Divorce. First Triennial Charge. By the Right Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., Bishop of Vermont. (New York : Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896.)

BISHOP HALL'S Charge is to a large extent concerned with the lamentable frequency of Divorce in America, and with practical matters in connexion with the exercise of discipline in the American Church. It contains, also, a high-toned assertion of the claims of Christian morality, and a temperate and well-reasoned plea on behalf of the absolute indissolubility of validly contracted Christian marriages. Amid the faltering utterances we are accustomed to hear on this important subject, it is refreshing to find the Bishop of Vermont instructing the clergy and laity of his diocese with so great fidelity to the teaching of Christ and the law of the Christian Church. Church people in England, as well as in America, need to be reminded that

'the Christian Church has a code of morals just as imperious in its claims as the rule of faith given in the Creeds. . . . To bear witness to the Divine law is the very purpose of the Church's existence in the world. If she is to leaven human society, she must faithfully uphold this standard at any cost ; and that both by her teaching and by the exercise of discipline, refusing her privileges to those who transgress the Divine commandment' (p. 3).

On the subject of the indissolubility of marriage, Bishop Hall shows that the passages in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke and in the First Epistle to the Corinthians

'are plain, and lay down the law for the Christian Church, without any exception, of the indissolubility of marriage once rightly contracted. It would be strange that an intended exception should have been altogether omitted by two out of the three Evangelists who record our Lord's teaching on the subject, as well as by St. Paul, who, writing at an earlier date than that of any of the Gospels, bears witness to the tradition of the Apostolic Church concerning Christ's teaching' (p. 17).

He then proceeds to consider the passages in St. Matthew's Gospel, and states his conclusions as follows :

'As regards the passage in the Sermon on the Mount, comparison with the other reports of our Lord's teaching fairly constitutes a presumption that He was not here making an exception to the general law of the indissolubility of Christian marriage, but that He here recognizes (as in 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11) the right of a husband to put away (in separation) an unchaste wife, without giving any sanction to a fresh union, which could only be allowed on the supposition that the former marriage had been actually dissolved.

'The passage in St. Matt. xix. 9 presents a further difficulty; for, as it stands in our received text, it seems to sanction the remarriage of one who, for the cause of adultery or fornication, has put away his wife.¹ Of course, if we were sure of our Lord's words here, and of their meaning, the omission of any such permission from His teaching, as given by the other Evangelists, would not affect a plain declaration in this one Gospel. But the silence of the other Evangelists naturally leads us to view this passage with a certain suspicion, to subject it to a careful examination. We then find that the text is extremely doubtful; that the words which allow that a man who has put away his wife may marry another are wanting in two of the five great manuscripts; that one of the other three has a confused text in this crucial passage; that the earliest writers of the Christian Church who quote the passage, quote it without the words which allow remarriage; that the Revisers of the English Version in our own generation felt constrained to give in the margin the alternative reading of ancient authority, which omits the clause which alone in the whole of the New Testament recognizes the lawfulness of the man's marrying another woman. Surely it is most perilous to rest so momentous a doctrine as this exception really is on so feeble and doubtful a foundation' (pp. 18-19).

Bishop Hall afterwards mentions some weighty 'arguments from reason or experience' which 'harmonize' with the conclusion drawn from Holy Scripture (pp. 19-21), gives apt quotations from 'the words of three men eminent in secular life—a philosopher, a jurist, and a statesman' (pp. 21-24), and ends with a practical appeal (pp. 24-25).

We hope this excellent Charge may be widely read and carefully considered, both in America and in England.

The Sermon on the Mount. A Practical Exposition. By CHARLES GORE, M.A., D.D. Edinb., of the Community of the Resurrection, Canon of Westminster. (London: John Murray, 1896.)

CANON GORE has given us in this little book an admirable exposition of the Sermon on the Mount in its practical bearing on Christian life. It is likely to be helpful in stimulating and guiding thought, especially for those who, as the writer evidently intends, will use its comments on our Lord's words as suggestions for meditations of their own. It is a work of a kind which does not call for any detailed description or criticism from a reviewer, and all that we desire to do in this notice is to direct attention to its strong grasp alike on the principles of our Lord's moral teaching and on the circumstances of modern life, and to the position taken up by Canon Gore on matters of present practical importance.

There is an excellent statement with regard to a claim frequently made for Mohammedanism.

'We have often heard it said that more people are good Mohammedans in Mohammedan countries than good Christians in Christian

¹ It may be doubted whether, even with the received text, the passage in St. Matt. xix. 9 sanctions re-marriage. See *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1896, p. 427, note 3.

country
fore his
natural
change
saw the
and to
These,
measur
spicuous
of relig
his reli
effecte
'But
founda
to a fr
it plain
without
has fou
of thos
spiritua

On
itself a
extract

'Al
Christ,
ciples
adulter
(2) tha
Church
(p. 215
'G

innocen
law of
is not,
law on
for Cor
to whic
the Ch
simply
ference

'Th
collisio
accord
little re
the pro
here in

1 C
more th
prohibi
2 It
gest th
who, af
a civil
refusal

countries. That may be true, and for this reason: Mohammed set before his disciples an ideal of conduct calculated to commend itself naturally to the people he had to do with. Supposing no fundamental change of character, no real transformation, was required of them, he saw that they would be ready enough to observe religious ceremonies, and to fight, and to abstain from drink. He fastened on these things. These, he said, are what God requires of you. And he has won a high measure of success on the average. Mohammedans have been conspicuous for courage and temperance and regularity in the transaction of religious forms. But just because Mohammed was so easily satisfied, his religion has been a religion of stagnation. He neither aimed at nor effected any regeneration of man.

'But our Lord said, "Except a man be born again,"—i.e. unless so fundamental a change take place in him, that it can only be compared to a fresh birth—"he cannot see the kingdom of God." And He made it plain that the working out of this new birth would not be possible without the sternest self-denial. For this very reason our Lord's religion has found fewer *genuine* adherents than Mohammedanism, but by means of those who have been genuine adherents it has effected a profound spiritual renewal even in society as a whole' (pp. 47-8).

On the subject of Divorce Canon Gore writes both in the book itself and in a brief appendix. From the latter we make the following extracts:—

'Above, in the text of the exposition, it has been maintained (1) that Christ, by a distinct act of legislation, prohibited divorce among His disciples in such sense as allows of remarriage, except in the case of the adultery of one of the parties, in which case He did not prohibit it; but (2) that the Church law and tradition in England, as in the whole Western Church, maintains the absolute indissolubility of the marriage tie' (p. 215).

'Granted then (1) that Christ did not prohibit¹ the remarriage of an innocent party after a divorce for adultery, (2) that the unaltered Church law of England does prohibit it, it seems to me that the best course is *not*, at least in the present state of Church feeling, to alter the Church law on the matter, up to the point which Christ allows, by getting leave for Convocation to make a new Canon—though this would be a course to which no one could take just exception—but to retain and observe the Church law, allowing no remarriage with the rites of the Church, but simply leaving it to bishops to act on the decision of the Lambeth Conference as far as admission to communion is concerned.²

'This refusal to allow remarriage in churches may involve some collision with statute law till an equitable concession to our principles is accorded. But the difficulty is not greater than has been overcome by a little resolution in the case of the Public Worship Regulation Act. If in the process of the controversy the institution of compulsory civil marriage here in England, with the same publicity as in most foreign countries, to

¹ Canon Gore here adds a note: 'It is perhaps hardly fair to say more than this. Christ simply exempted a particular case from a general prohibition, leaving the Church free in regard to it.'

² It should be observed that the Lambeth Conference did not suggest that the Bishops should order the admission to Communion of those who, after divorce for the adultery of the other party, have gone through a civil ceremony of remarriage, but only that they should not order the refusal of sacraments to such persons.

be followed by a voluntary religious ceremony, becomes a more likely event, there would be a good many Churchmen who would not regret it' (pp. 217-8).

We have so often of late referred to this subject¹ that it is unnecessary we should do more here than call attention to the significance of the fact that the view which Canon Gore takes of the teaching of our Lord does not lead him to think an alteration of the existing law of the Church of England which prohibits the remarriage of any divorced persons to be desirable.

We should do an injustice to this book if we made it appear to be of a controversial character. Topics such as we have mentioned inevitably present themselves in the treatment of the Sermon on the Mount; but the book is throughout pervaded by the sense that society is to be made better by the personal religious lives of Christians, and it is with personal religious life that it is mainly concerned.

Gleanings, Spiritual, Doctrinal, and Practical. By W. H. HUTCHINGS, M.A., Canon of York, Rector of Kirby Misperton, and Rural Dean of Malton. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1896).

CANON HUTCHINGS'S new book consists of a number of short papers on subjects as various as 'The Dogma of the Incarnation,' 'The Office of Sponsors in Holy Baptism,' 'Spiritual Progress and Meditation,' 'Parochial Missions,' and 'Clerical Study.' They are marked by the combination of accurate theology, learning, disciplined enthusiasm, and strong common sense which we are accustomed to associate with this writer's work.

Among the more valuable doctrinal papers are that on 'The Dogma of the Incarnation'² and those entitled respectively 'Universalism' and 'The Eschatology of the Church.' Among those of a practical character that on 'Clerical Study' is of some special utility, both from its emphasis on the obligation and need of study on the part of the clergy and from the advice which it gives as to the methods in which this duty may be carried out. The paper which deals with Meditation is of high spiritual value.

As an example of Canon Hutchings's style and teaching we may quote what he says on the 'effects of Confirmation.'

'In Confirmation the Holy Spirit is given. The Apostles did not go down to Samaria to perform "a mere ceremony," but to administer the

¹ See especially the articles in the *Church Quarterly Review* for April 1895 and January 1896 entitled 'Divorce' and 'The Present Aspect of the Controversy on Divorce,' in which the whole subject is fully dealt with.

² We notice on p. 41 that the author, writing on the question whether the Son of God would have become incarnate if man had not sinned, says, 'I remember an interesting conversation upon this point with Dr. Liddon, many years ago, and my impression was he was disposed to cling to the Thomist view.' It might have been well to add a reference to Dr. Liddon's *Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford*, first series, p. 241, note 2, where the Thomist view is definitely accepted.

"sacrament"
we affirm
in Baptism
must not
are baptis
Baptism
the men
partake
Spirit of
Baptism
accordi
a truth
Baptism
sacram
receive
the gift
Holy S
the Ho
the fir
spiritua
ings ma
have lif
one way
superac

'In
end, an
betoken
of God
Sancti

'Th
fore it
indelibi
all eter
special
faith of
reach o
for the
(pp. 20

Archbi
A
T

THIS b
ances c
stay in
its cont
at Dub
meeting
cumsta
conside
which
mentio
which

VOL

"sacramental complement" of Baptism. But we must be careful, whilst we affirm that the Holy Spirit is given in Confirmation, not to forget that in Baptism the same Spirit has already made the soul His Temple. We must not obscure the effects of the greater in commending the less. We are baptized into the Name of the *Three* Divine Persons, and in Holy Baptism we are "born of water *and of the Spirit*." We are then made the members of Christ, but they who are members of Christ "must needs partake of the Spirit that is in Him, their Head. Neither doth the Spirit of Christ merely follow upon, but accompanies, the Sacrament of Baptism," says Bishop Beveridge. By that Sacrament we are made, according to St. Chrysostom, "the temple and organ of the Holy Ghost," a truth clearly set forth in the Anglican office for the "Ministration" of Baptism. To obscure this is not really to elevate Confirmation. Its sacramental dignity is maintained by the fact that the qualification to receive "the Plenitude of the Holy Spirit" is the possession already of the gift of the Spirit. In Confirmation there is a second largess of the Holy Spirit, the "complement" of the Baptismal Gift. In Confirmation the Holy Spirit comes in His fulness. Increase of indwelling grace is the first effect of this Ordinance. Baptism is the commencement of spiritual life, Confirmation its increase. The two in their relative workings may be described by the words of Christ, "I am come that they may have life, and that they may have it more abundantly." But greater in one way is the transition from death unto life than that from life to a superadded vitality; the one is a difference of kind, the other of degree.

In the next place, every means of grace is instituted to work a *special end*, and the special end or purpose of Confirmation is, as its name betokens, strength. By Baptism, it has been said, we become children of God; by Confirmation, soldiers. Confirmation is "Donatio Spiritus Sancti ad robur." . . .

Thirdly, divines teach that Confirmation confers *character*, and therefore it is one of those rites which cannot be repeated. Character is an indelible spiritual mark, a spiritual power which is a fixture in the soul to all eternity, contributing to its glory or increasing its shame. The speciality of character in Confirmation is strength in witnessing to the faith of Christ. Confirmation is called "the seal of the Lord." Its effects reach out into another world. Confirmation not only supplies fortitude for the hour of conflict and trial; but also adds radiance to the crown' (pp. 201-3).

Archbishop Benson in Ireland. A Record of his Irish Sermons and Addresses, 1896. Edited by J. H. BERNARD, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1896.)

THIS book has a pathetic interest. It contains the last public utterances of the late Archbishop of Canterbury and a brief record of his stay in Ireland just before his death. The most important part of its contents is comprised in the three sermons preached respectively at Dublin, Kildare, and Armagh, and in the speech delivered at a meeting held in the Metropolitan Hall, Dublin. If under any circumstances there was room for criticism, it would be hushed in the consideration of the sad event which so quickly followed the words which Dr. Bernard's volume records; and we may be content to mention that the sermons and speech contain the high qualities for which Archbishop Benson's work was known, and to quote a power-

VOL. XLIII.—NO. LXXXVI.

L L

ful passage in which he described the true position of the English Church.

'As to past and present, our appeal is to history. Our Church no more sought a *via media* between Rome and Geneva than St. George's Channel invented a *via media* between England and Ireland. Our Church created no new factitious platform of authority. . . . When the glorious awakening came with the Greek language, and literature, and art, and criticism, and philosophy—then, with the invigoration of a fresh morning and an upspringing wind, the Church shook herself free. But it was with no eye to compromise that the bright spirit of the Reformation took its course. "Truth, truth," was the moving star which guided its gaze to the sun. That spirit had no mind to break the thread of the Church's history. Witness in every hand the Prayer Book and its clear-voiced Preface on "the wisdom of the Church of England." . . . Witness the memorable appeal of Cranmer himself from his unjust sentence, addressed neither to Rome nor Rome's enemies: "I appeal to the next General Council." It is an appeal which we firmly believe will one day be heard. . . . Still, in Cranmer's words, "we have in great reverence the authority of our Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, to whom our mind is in all things to obey." Still our mind, like his, is purely and simply to initiate and teach those things only which we have learned of the sacred Scripture and of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ from the beginning, and also according to the exposition of the most holy and learned fathers of the Church. . . . It is no doctrine of ours that there are happy souls, lofty ethereal spirits, which may be able to dispense with an Incarnation, an Atonement, a Resurrection, to dispense with prayer, and sacraments, and orders and grace. We say these things are sober facts. These are truths, these are realities, and none can dispense with them any more than he can dispense with gravitation or electricity from the material world. A man may be an unbeliever, but he cannot dispense with these and be a Christian. The way and the truth are essential to the life' (pp. 61-4).

The Supernatural: a Rational View of the Divine Word and of the Dual Nature of Man. By KATHOLIKOS. With Introduction by the Rev. J. W. REYNOLDS, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's. (London: Elliot Stock, 1896.)

THE object of the author of this book is described in the preface. It

'is to bring before the rising generation, in as simple a form as possible, the fact, which scientific writers are proving by each new discovery they make, that there is not a single thing in creation, great or small, which does not, when rightly understood, show *per se*, that it was made by One who had all power, all knowledge, and all skill; and that this Maker is *now*, as in the moment of creation, unchanged in His designs and purposes' (p. v).

In trying to accomplish this object a good deal of knowledge and skill is used, and the book is written in a style easy to understand and follow. It consists of four chapters, entitled 'The Reality of the Supernatural,' 'The Great Sacrament—God in Nature,' 'The Great Procession,' 'The Great Kingdom.' It presses strongly the argument from design and the moral phenomena of the life of our

Lord
tha

2
ment
some
of an
differ
the M
thing
very
diffic

In
in a
the b

'T
sion,
menta
expla
less in
benefi

W
Coun
strang
not s
mend
Filiog

Conce

R
A
A
A
A

THESE
hope
readin
parish
have b
actual
'perha
with a
of rem

In
freque
and th
author
in pro
sistenc
calm
wholly

Lord and the existence and work of the Church. The standpoint is that of an English Catholic.

The Supernatural is in some respects an odd book. If our judgment about it is correct, it will be found to be singularly attractive to some types of minds, and to others almost repellent. The mixture of argument with spiritual thoughts and exhortations will strike different readers in different ways. We should hesitate to put it into the hands of some who need to realize the existence of unseen things and the truth of Christianity; we should expect it to be the very book which might help others through problems and out of difficulties.

In the short Introduction Prebendary Reynolds has summarized, in a slightly different form, the main lines of thought contained in the book. He strongly commends it by saying—

‘This book is remarkable for historical illustration, felicity of expression, correct reasoning, and truthful zeal. It is not a laborious, argumentative treatise on a difficult subject; but an intelligent, well-reasoned explanation, pleasant and easy. A large class of readers will find it not less interesting than useful. Every thoughtful, honest reader will derive benefit from the perusal’ (Intro. p. xiii).

We have been a little puzzled by the expression ‘last Œcumenical Council of Nice,’ on p. 197. ‘Last Œcumenical Council’ would be a strange description of the Council of 325, while the context does not seem to be appropriate to that of 787. And we cannot commend the phraseology used in connexion with the insertion of the *Filioque* clause in the Creed on p. 233.

Concerning the Church. A Course of Sermons. By JOSEPH HAMMOND, LL.B., Vicar of St. Austell and Canon of Truro; Author of *Church or Chapel: an Eirenicon*; *English Nonconformity and Christ's Christianity*; *Seal and Sacrament*; *The Forgiveness of Sins*, &c. &c. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1896.)

THESE Sermons have been published by Canon Hammond ‘in the hope that some of’ the ‘clergy may think them not unsuited for reading in their churches or for lending or recommending to their parishioners’ (Preface, p. v). Many of them in their present form have been written for publication as a book, but some of them have actually been preached and all have been delivered ‘in substance,’ ‘perhaps more than once’ (*ibid.* p. viii). The subjects are all chosen with a view to provide instruction about the Church and the duty of remaining or becoming Church people.

In reading this volume we have noticed many omissions; it frequently suggests questions which it makes no attempt to solve; and that there are indications of a want of solid learning in its author. In spite of these features we think it likely to be very useful in promoting true ideas about the Church and exposing the inconsistencies and weaknesses of Dissent. It is written throughout in a calm and charitable spirit and in temperate language, while it is wholly free from the false charity which cloaks the truth. Its popular

form makes it suitable for wide circulation, and the clergy will do well if they place it in the hands of many ill-instructed Church people and inquiring Dissenters.

We may quote the last words of the sermon on 'The Reunion of the Church' as containing both encouragement and warning for those who are distressed by existing divisions.

'You can promote reunion in a very simple and effectual way. The holier our lives, the more candid and truthful we are, the more we conquer envy and jealousy and meanness, the more hope for a reunited Church. Reunion is very largely a question of character. Disunion is the result of deterioration. . . . Division has been caused by giving way to nature . . . reunion can only be attained by yielding ourselves to the grace, the charity, and gentleness of God. So that reunion is mainly a question of character. If we Christians were but Christlike, our difficulties would disappear at once. . . . Let us open our hearts to the teaching of His good Spirit, and so the prayer of our Lord shall be accomplished. "The gift of unity"—I think it was Dr. von Döllinger said this—"will not be grasped by any rash human hands; it will come down from above in the indwelling of the Holy One, and will come, as all other blessings, when the Church is ready to receive it"' (pp. 338-9).

The Golden Gate. A Manual of Church Doctrine and Devotions. By the Rev. S. BARING GOULD, M.A. New and Revised Edition. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1896.)

WE regret that we cannot recommend for general use this new edition of Mr. Baring Gould's devotional manual, *The Golden Gate*. There is very much in the Devotions, which form the second and third parts of the volume, and not a little in the Instructions, which comprise the first part, which is of value and likely to be helpful. The 'subjects for special prayer,' on pp. 357-64, taken from the *Hour of Sacrifice*, seem to us a specially useful feature. Those Church people who will look through the book and select from it what is suitable for their own use may find it suggestive. But the faults by which it is marked prevent it from being a book which can rightly be put into the hands of any who would be dependent upon it and be incapable of testing its statements. Passing by a somewhat unfortunate description of Antichrist and his time (pp. 30-31), we observe that God the Son is ignored in the statement about the Procession of the Holy Spirit (p. 32); a number of passages in the New Testament¹ are declared to be unintelligible if εὐχαριστία is translated 'thanksgiving' (p. 85); it is stated as if a certain fact that 'in Apostolic times every Priest was consecrated Bishop as well' (p. 99), and 'for some time the Apostles ordained Bishops to the different Churches founded by them, and the priesthood was not separated till a few years later' (p. 111). There are other matters open to criticism, and the general treatment of history strikes us as very unsatisfactory; but it is a more serious fault that we should find in connexion with the Eucharistic Sacrifice the extraordinary assertion, 'Our sins committed eighteen hundred and more years after the Crucifixion could not have been taken away by that act, for a thing cannot be taken

¹ 2 Cor. iv. 15, ix. 12; Phil. iv. 6; Col. ii. 7, iv. 2.

away
reason
living
It is
the m
and
offer

Russ

ONE
tion
Servi
appe
No o
subje
close
timat
many
to sp
Russ
reade
by no
we ar
fifths
Easte
T
miak
epist
has i
of Ro
and a
time
and
corre
were
torica
Most
for t
collec
printe
cover
an ol
letter
Russi
are, th

away which does not exist' (p. 87), and that it should be stated as a reason why 'the dead can receive benefit from the prayers of the living' that 'till the judgment the eternal state is not fixed' (p. 42). It is a matter of the highest importance to maintain true belief as to the relation of the Eucharistic Sacrifice to the Sacrifice of the Cross, and as to the object and effects of those prayers which the Church offers for the Faithful Departed.

Russia and the English Church during the Last Fifty Years. Vol. I., containing a Correspondence between Mr. William Palmer, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and M. Khomiakoff in the years 1844-1854. Edited by W. J. BIRKBECK, M.A., F.S.A. Published for the Eastern Church Association. (London: Rivington, Percival, and Co., 1895.)

ONE of the two practical objects which the Eastern Church Association sets before itself is to 'publish books bearing on the History and Services of the Eastern Churches.' One such volume has already appeared, viz. the *East Syrian Daily Offices*, edited by Mr. Maclean. No one could have been found in England more fit to deal with the subject of the Russian Church than Mr. Birkbeck. Not only has he closely studied the literature and history of that Church, but by intimate acquaintance with many of its leading men and by visits to many even of its more remote sacred places he has qualified himself to speak from first-hand knowledge of the Orthodox Church of Russia. And if Mr. Birkbeck is competent to enlighten English readers, the subject is one the importance of which will be minimized by no one who is interested in the Reunion of Christendom, for, as we are reminded, the Russian Church 'in numbers constitutes four-fifths, and in learning represents at least nine-tenths of the whole Eastern orthodox Communion.'

The volume now under notice contains twelve letters of M. Khomiakoff to William Palmer, and five letters in reply, together with an epistle dedicatory in a volume of poems. Besides these Mr. Birkbeck has included Mr. Palmer's confession of faith on joining the Church of Rome, written in 1855, an essay on the Church by M. Khomiakoff, and a letter written by Mr. Palmer to Count Alexis Tolstoi, at the time Procurator of the Holy Synod. Mr. Birkbeck has been active, and we must also add fortunate, in recovering so much of this correspondence in its original form. The letters of M. Khomiakoff were sent back by Mr. Palmer, and found a resting-place in the Historical Museum at Moscow, where they were copied by Mr. Birkbeck. Most of them had been already published in a Russian translation—for they were originally written in English—in M. Khomiakoff's collected works, but two of them, not included there, were first printed in 1892 in a Russian journal. Mr. Palmer's letters were recovered from Miss Khomiakoff, in whose house they were found in an old writing desk, and are now printed for the first time. The letter of Mr. Palmer, addressed to Count Tolstoi, was first printed in Russia in 1894, and now appears for the first time in English. We are, therefore, indebted to Mr. Birkbeck for the recovery in large

measure, as well as for the publication, of this correspondence between 'a very friendly but very definite Russian layman' and Mr. Palmer.

In the Introduction Mr. Birkbeck is careful to explain the importance of M. Khomiakoff from the point of view of Russian theology. This he does by a long extract from the introduction to Khomiakoff's theological works, written by Mr. G. Samarin, from which we may take a few sentences.

'Our orthodox School of Theology was not in a position to define either Latinism or Protestantism, because that in departing from its own orthodox standpoint it had itself become divided into two, and that each of these halves had taken up a position opposed indeed to its opponent, Latin or Protestant, but not above him. It was Khomiakoff who first looked upon Latinism and Protestantism from the Church's own point of view, and therefore from a *higher* standpoint. . . . Not less striking in its novelty was the system upon which Khomiakoff conducted his controversial undertakings. Up to this time our learned theological disputes had lost themselves in particularism. . . . Khomiakoff sets to work in a very different manner. Passing from manifestations to their original causes, he reproduces, if one may so express it, a physical genealogy of each error, and brings them back together to their common starting-point, in which the error, on being exposed to view, reveals itself in its inner inconsistency. . . . If we go further into Khomiakoff's theological writings, and pass from his system to their contents, we shall find another distinguishing characteristic. . . . When the sky is clear and the sun is shining brightly every passing vapour shows itself off against the sky in all its outlines and limits, as a cloud, as an object, the opposite of light. Khomiakoff cleared the region of light, the atmosphere of the Church, and consequently false doctrine as it passed across it appeared of its own accord in the shape of a negation of the light, as a dark spot on the sky. The boundaries and outlines of false doctrine became evident and self-defined' (pp. xlv-xlvii).

These extracts show the importance which the Russians themselves attached to Khomiakoff's work, as defining and giving logical expression to orthodox theology. We need only add to these extracts that Khomiakoff was a great admirer of England, well acquainted with its language and literature, and a close observer of ecclesiastical events in Western Europe.

Having said these few words to make clear Khomiakoff's position to our readers, we may turn to the correspondence itself, for the personality of William Palmer is so familiar that we need not tarry over that. The correspondence begins with a letter of M. Khomiakoff thanking Mr. Palmer for a translation into English of some Russian verses, and the question of union between East and West is introduced in connection with Mr. Palmer's insistence on the necessity of praying heartily for 'the union of all.' This union, says M. Khomiakoff, is impossible without 'a perfect unity of doctrine.' 'Union is possible with Rome. Unity alone is possible with orthodoxy' (p. 8). 'To secure this unity England must 'tear itself from its past,' must say not merely, 'We have protested against Church abuses and gone too far in our protests. Now we retrace our steps,' but, 'We have been schismatical for ages and ages, even since the dawn of our intellectual life.' And so Khomiakoff regards the chief obstacle to reunion

(pp. 3
the
such
and 2
mark
more
while
witho
of mi
by th
truth
from
this
natio
diti
the fa
Arian
even
East

'
ortho
ours
is a P
the tr
very
supre
would
all wo

A
one r
is ill
Bish
best
of mu

'
Eccle
Chur
the u
Hiera
the C
of th
funct
essen
of un
indivi
as a c
direct
the b

In
to jo

(pp. 38, 56, 68, &c.) as more moral than doctrinal. If, says Palmer, the Eastern Church claims to be the only true Church, as the use of such language would imply, then it should show some signs of life and zeal, instead of an absence of that missionary spirit which is so marked in the Roman Catholic Church. The Eastern Church is, moreover, inconsistent in regarding the Latin Church as heretical, while at the same time it has been willing to communicate with it, without a full retraction and denial of that heresy. The absence of missionary zeal towards the West is explained, says Khomiakoff, by the fact that 'the reluctance of the West to admit the simple truth arises neither from ignorance nor from rational objections, but from a moral obstacle which no human efforts can conquer,' and this deficiency is 'not a defect in the Church herself, but in the nations that compose her communities'; and as to 'the easy conditions on which communion was proposed to the Latin community,' the false doctrine of Rome is not a heresy in the sense in which Arianism was. A few pages later M. Khomiakoff emphasizes that, even supposing the facts of doctrine to be accepted identically by East and West, that would not be sufficient.

'Suppose an impossibility—suppose all the Anglicans to be quite orthodox: suppose their Creed and Faith to be quite concordant with ours: the mode and process by which that creed is or has been attained is a Protestant one: a simple logical act of the understanding, by which the tradition and writings of the Fathers have been distilled to something very near Truth. If we admit this all is lost, and Rationalism is the supreme judge of every question. . . . Were you to find all the truth, you would have found nothing; for we alone can give you that without which all would be vain—the assurance of truth' (pp. 70-1).

And this conception of the difference between East and West as one not so much of disagreement on definite points as of standpoint is illustrated in a subsequent letter, where the reply of the Eastern Bishops to an encyclical of Pius IX. is quoted, and, as it is perhaps the best illustration of Khomiakoff's position, we must, even at the risk of multiplying extracts, give the passage *in extenso*.

'The Pope is greatly mistaken in supposing that we consider the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy to be the guardian of the dogma [of the Church]. The case is quite different. The unvarying constancy and the unerring truth of Christian dogma does not depend upon any Hierarchical Order: it is guarded by the totality, by the whole *people* of the Church, which is the body of Christ. The gift of truth is [in this reply of the Eastern patriarchs] strictly separated from the hierarchical functions (viz. from Sacramental and Disciplinary power), and the essential distinction from the Roman notion is thus established; the gift of unvarying knowledge (which is nothing but faith) is attributed not to individuals but to the totality of the ecclesiastical body, and is considered as a corollary of the moral principle of mutual love. This position is in direct contradiction to the individualism and rationalism which lies at the bottom of every Protestant doctrine' (pp. 94-5).

In a subsequent letter Mr. Palmer states his difficulties in regard to joining either the Greek or the Russian part of the Eastern Church.

In regard to the Greek there was the difficulty of rebaptism, while as to Russia, the 'present relations of the Spiritual and Civil power within the Russian Empire' were an insurmountable difficulty (pp. 116-8), and so the prospect is suggested of joining the Roman Catholic body as the Church which is most nearly 'identical in essence (*e.g.* in the spirit and idea of universality, in zeal and charity for particular souls, and in its attitude of independence, and, if need be, opposition to the powers of this world in spiritual things) with the Church of the first ages' (pp. 120-1). In his answering letter Khomiakoff deals with these objections against the 'want of charity' of the one half and the 'want of liberty' of the other half of the Orthodox Church, and explains that the latent energy of the Russian Church is stifled by a delusive (though unconsciously delusive) protection (p. 133), and that this relation between Church and State in Russia is merely 'an historical and not an ecclesiastical fact' (p. 159). As the main interest of the book is in the attitude represented by Khomiakoff, we may pass over the letters in which Palmer explains the process by which he finally joined the Roman Catholic communion, and his profession of faith in so doing. We will conclude our account of the contents of this volume by one or two extracts from Khomiakoff's *Essay on the Unity of the Church*. Thus, 'The notes of the Earthly Church are inward holiness, which does not allow of any admixture of error, for the spirit of truth lives within her; and outward unchangeableness, for Christ, her Preserver and Head, does not change' (p. 195); and again (*ibid.*), 'It is impossible that there should have been a time when she could have received error into her bosom, or when the laity, presbyters, and bishops had submitted to instructions or teaching inconsistent with the teaching and spirit of Christ'; and a few pages later (p. 204), 'The visible Church is not the visible Society of Christians, but the Spirit of God, and the grace of the Sacraments living in this Society.' With this last statement we may contrast the words of Art. XIX., '*The visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men,*' &c., and we shall see at once the difference of conception in Western and Eastern minds.

These letters are carefully edited by Mr. Birkbeck with as few changes as possible, and also with a certain number of explanatory notes, which might perhaps have been advantageously increased. A certain number of slips have escaped correction, *e.g.* on p. xxvii, idiosyncracies; p. xxxi, *respect* for *respect*; p. xlv, *which* for *who*; p. xlv, *were* for *was*; p. liv, to throw away doubt for to throw any doubt; p. 120, *is* for *are*; and on the page after the preface why are the dates of the correspondence given as 1851-53? We shall look with impatience for the second volume of this work, in which Mr. Birkbeck will no doubt deal with a number of the definite points of difference between the Russian Church and ourselves, to which allusion is made in the book before us.

WE
Coun
the
that
subj
cut
oppo
for t
of r
pictu
and
been
foun
light
Trid
most
aspe
with
we o
Of c
cour
emb
ness.
its a
as w
relie
work
A
cont
the C
of th
first
main
auth
unwi
hand
time
need
the
char
vivid
spirit
of th
amer
inter
whic

Lectures on the Council of Trent, delivered at Oxford, 1892-3. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, late Regius Professor of Modern History. (London and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896.)

WE confess to some disappointment with these *Lectures on the Council of Trent*. The period which their title embraces is one of the most fascinating in European history, and was big with issues that divide Modern from Mediæval and earlier history. The special subject, moreover, the Council of Trent, which gave clear and clean-cut outline to the dogma of the Latin Church, presents innumerable opportunities to the historian for lucid exposition of great principles, for the exercise of the highest powers of discrimination, for the use of no ordinary learning, and affords besides a field for the most picturesque delineation of events brilliant with every variety of tone and colour. It has, too, the further advantage that it has not yet been adequately handled by any English historian. On the grand foundation of Paolo Sarpi's monumental work, with the additional light which subsequent writers have brought to bear upon it, the Tridentine assembly supplies an unrivalled theme, worthy of the most accomplished artist, and, regarded in some of its broader aspects only, it is an ideal study for a University professor. It was with the expectations which such thoughts as these had kindled that we opened the volume before us. Perhaps we expected too much. Of course so able a writer could not fail to interest his readers. Of course, too, the fragmentary portion of the Council, which alone is embraced in these Lectures, deprives them of all claim to completeness. The book, moreover, has been published after the decease of its author, and lacks in consequence his final touches and corrections, as well as the references to the authorities on which the Professor relied and which are highly important for a rightful estimate of his work.

At the outset we should notice that of the thirteen lectures contained in the volume before us less than half are occupied with the Council in actual session. The first three deal with the condition of the Church, the indulgences, and the edict of Worms. On the first of these subjects, and throughout the volume, Mr. Froude relies mainly on Roman Catholic—Catholic he incorrectly terms them—authorities for his picture of the abuses then prevalent and the unwillingness of the Papal Court to remove them. A less skilful hand than Mr. Froude's could make a striking portraiture of the times from the rich stores of material at command. Nor does it need elaborate insistence upon the absolute necessity for reform—the evils were flagrant, intolerable, confessed. The most striking characteristics of Mr. Froude's treatment of his subject are the vividness with which he portrays the unendurable intrusion by the spiritual courts into every department of secular life, the perplexity of the Papal Court under the peril which the granting or the refusal of amendment alike seemed to involve, and the labyrinth of conflicting interests in which the Emperor Charles V. was entangled, and from which he was extricated mainly through his consummate sagacity

and persistent moderation. Never is the writer's heart so entirely in his work as when he is describing the wisdom and the heroism of the German sovereign.

'In all the Empire,' he writes, 'in all Europe, there was, perhaps, not a single man on whom Providence had laid so many burdens as it had flung on the heavy-laden Charles. It was not enough that he had a jealous rival in Paris, always watching for a weak point to set upon. It was not enough that he had a religious revolution to compose and direct, which was changing the face of Europe, and shifty Popes and obstinate Diets to work with. It was not enough that he had the vast hosts of Solyman, hanging for ever like a thunder cloud over the eastern provinces of Germany. Any one of these problems would have sufficed to occupy the whole energy of the ablest and most powerful of sovereigns. But a new enemy had now sprung up, who required to be immediately dealt with. The Moorish corsairs, under the famous Barbarossa, had developed into a force as formidable as the Cilician pirates had been in Pompey's time. . . . Christendom ought to have combined to root out such a nest of villany. Christendom would do nothing of the kind. It was all left to Charles. Henry VIII., who had been threatened with an invasion from Flanders, was not displeased to see Charles with his hands full elsewhere. The French, it was said, would make an alliance with the Devil to be revenged on the Emperor, and regarded the Moors rather as friends than as foes. The Germans were a land power and could not help. Charles—loyal, chivalrous, ready always to go where duty called him—undertook to deal with the intolerable nuisance. He collected a fleet in Sicily at his own expense. He took the command in person, stormed the Tunis forts, liberated twenty thousand Christian slaves, burnt the corsair squadrons, and for a time cleared the seas. It was an exploit worthy of a knight of romance, to be sung of by poets. He returned, covered with honour, to take up again the other burdens, which had not grown lighter in his absence' (pp. 112, 113).

When Mr. Froude deals with the Council of Trent in actual session we lose confidence in his judgment and impartiality. It is not ours to defend either the Council's definition of doctrine or the anathemas by which they were enforced: but the writer who quotes with approval the remark of Gibbon, that 'in theological councils the opinion most remote from what we call reason *invariably* prevails' (p. 233), obviously lacks the sympathy which is essential to the right comprehension of his task. We sincerely regret that Mr. Froude's great powers were not devoted to a more congenial subject. In the life of Charles V., to which he had designed to devote a further set of Lectures, he would have found a magnificent opportunity and a hero exactly to his mind.

The Wells Office Book. Prime and Hours with other Services for the use of Wells Theological College. (London: John Hodges, 1896.)

As is right and proper, and in accordance with ancient usage, this book of services is put forth with a commendatory letter from the bishop of the diocese. It is for use, merely out of devotion, for those who have satisfied the requirements of the Prayer Book by reciting the daily Mattins and Evensong there set forth, and yet

wish
are th
vices,
the c
comm
were
broug
Bede
Angl
Apos
morn
Sext,
cours
secul
and p
the M
suppl
custo
cises
like i

T
yet w
adopt
recita
have
third
Little
distri
is the
Beati
gives
that
Refor
centu
to am
truth,
went
légère
takes
does
touch
who
less h
there
Hum
only
neith
firme
1
illustr

wish to add something to the Morning and Evening Prayer which are the foundation of all other devotions for clergymen. Two services, morning and evening, seem to have been in primitive times the only opportunities which the faithful had of joining in the common praises of God. The Little Hours, such as this book gives, were later additions, and specially monastic. This has been lately brought out again into the light of day by a Benedictine monk, Dom Bede Plaine, in the October and November numbers of the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*. Lauds and Vespers, he says, go back to the Apostolic age, and are a continuation of the double sacrifice of the morning and evening of the synagogue. Mattins (*Vigilia*), Terce, Sext, and None were added after the fourth century, and fell in course of time to be the special duty of monks to recite, not of the secular clergy, while Prime and Compline are more recent again, and purely monastic. Thus the book before us is supplementary to the Mattins and Evensong of the Book of Common Prayer, which supplies all that is really needful in the eyes of the lover of primitive customs; while those whose devotion prompts them to further exercises may very well make use of the *Wells Office Book* or of others like it.

The Psalter chosen in these services is Gregorian in the main; and yet we cannot help thinking that it might have been better to have adopted a fresh distribution of the psalms, instead of the daily recitation of *Beati immaculati*. Would it not have been possible to have arranged the Psalter so as to secure a second or even a third recitation of it once a month? The Gregorian Psalter for the Little Hours has seemed to many ritualists the weakest part of its distribution; and, whenever the Psalter has been redistributed, this is the first part that has fallen. In the Benedictine distribution, *Beati immaculati* is recited on the first days of the week, and then gives place to other psalms. So also in the modern distributions—that of Quignon, for example, in the sixteenth century, and of the Reformed French breviaries in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The horror that Dom Bede Plaine shows of any attempt to amend the Gregorian distribution of the Psalter is, to tell the truth, a little amusing. The entire reconstruction that Prime underwent at the hands of Pius V. he qualifies as *une modification aussi légère*. Dom Bede positively asserts that the Gregorian distribution takes in the divine service the same place that the Canon of the Mass does in the Eucharist! that it is the sacred ark which no man may touch and live. This is a strange statement in the mouth of one who daily makes use of the Benedictine distribution, and has doubtless heard of the Ambrosian Psalter, reprinted only last year. And there is another distribution of the Psalter in the Breviary of the *Humiliati*, published in 1548, in which the whole Psalter is recited only once a month, and in a new sixteenth-century Latin version, neither Itala nor Vulgate; and both these radical changes are confirmed by an Apostolic Letter of Paul III.¹ Surely, then, it cannot

¹ See a paper on 'The Divine Service in the Sixteenth Century illustrated by the Reform of the Breviary of the "Humiliati" in 1548' for

be so great a crime, from Dom Bede's view even, to suggest amendments in the Gregorian Psalter.

This *Wells Book* seems to have been very carefully done. In the translations of the greater part of the book the editor has shown great wisdom in falling back upon the translations that we have in the Prayer Book and Authorized Version; we have none of that halting, unrhythmical, unbalanced English which is the bane of so many modern liturgical translations. Some of the collects on pp. 92-95 are well done, though a few do not quite please the ear, for the nineteenth century, we know, abhors style, and even the shackles of grammar.

And this leads us to make a suggestion to the Bishop and those who have to authorize these books for the use of candidates for Holy Orders. It is acknowledged that we have no liturgical translators now, and that familiarity with Latin is becoming a thing of the past in England. Why not bring out any future edition of these Little Hours in a Latin dress? It would render attempts at translation unnecessary, and thus save us from any further deterioration of language and grammar, and also encourage a familiarity with Latin which would be really a very great advantage to those who had it. We have an Anglican edition of Avancini's *Vita et Doctrina*, and a like Latin edition of the *Paradisus Animæ Christianæ* would be very welcome. Why does not some enterprising bookseller bring out an edition of the Latin Psalter, distributed as in the Book of Common Prayer, followed by the lessons from the Vulgate according to the new Lectionary? This would be a great assistance in making our clergy well practised in ecclesiastical Latin. Unless some steps of this sort be taken to check the tendency of the age, we may say farewell to all hopes of a priesthood at all familiar with Latin. The universities are doing nothing to help in this direction.

We may notice some vagaries of the printer. It looks odd to see *and* appearing in the midst of the Bishop of Bath and Wells' Latin signature. And we cannot remember any calendar in which the Finding of the Cross is commemorated on May 2. There are some well-chosen local additions to the Prayer Book Calendar, as become a Wells book: Laud, Ken, St. Aldhelm, St. Benignus, Bishop Law, the Dedication of the Church of Bath, and others. We should like to have kept the old psalms for preparation for communion (p. 121), unless it can be shown that those given are a special Wells use. In general the tone of the book is just what it should be—Anglican, local, and diocesan.

S. Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi Liber de Catechizandis Rudibus. Edited by Rev. W. YORKE FAUSSET, M.A., some time Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford, late Head Master of Ripon Grammar School, Editor of *Cicero pro Cluentio*. (London: Methuen and Co., 1896).

THE editor of this valuable treatise of St. Augustine ends his Introduction with the observation that 'it is to be regretted that no the text of the Letter (*Transactions of the Saint Paul's Ecclesiological Society*, London, 1886-90, vol. ii. p. 284). The new distribution of the Psalter is given on p. 278.

sixth
Chris
could
Afric
W
of th
such
prove
the s
may
who

I
Faus
whic
later

A
of St
book
such
ing c
of in
it ha
man
will l
well
to be
who
Espe
lesso
teach
to th
of di
easy
be p
of th
has
insta

S
suffi
diffi
note
howe
Aug
varia
doct

An

THE
hope

sixth-form boy is ever introduced to the great storehouse of early Christian literature, even at some risk to his Latin prose, which could not suffer much from an occasional contact with the vigorous African Latinity of St. Augustine' (Introd. p. xiv).

We venture to think that so far from the power of writing Latin of the Augustan age suffering from the learner being introduced to such Latin as appears in this treatise, it might be a source of improvement in the art in the hands of one competent to point out the slight variations of style, which after all are scarcely greater than may be detected in such writers as Cæsar and Tacitus, and others who are called classics.

In his useful Appendix, as well as in some of his notes, Mr. Fausset has called attention to some of those unclassical forms which the student will find in Ecclesiastical Latin of the fourth and later centuries.

Apart, however, from all consideration of style this small treatise of St. Augustine's might be recommended to be placed on the list of books which should be read by candidates for holy orders, and as such we trust it will find its way into the hands of bishops' examining chaplains. It is so full of common sense, and furnishes a mode of instruction which will be useful to the parochial clergy, now that it has come to be generally recognized that it is part of a clergyman's duty to catechize the children of his parish in church. Here will be found prescribed a method of dealing both with ignorant as well as educated persons, and both these styles will frequently have to be amalgamated for the sake of enlightening parents and others who bring children to church for the purpose of being catechized. Especially useful is the precept of keeping continual touch with the lessons of the Old Testament, which perhaps some, in their zeal for teaching the doctrines of the Christian faith, are apt to forget. Next to that is the recommendation to adapt the teaching to the variety of disposition and character of the hearer, which of course is more easy to apply in individual than in class teaching; and no reader need be prejudiced against the author's adoption of the mystical meaning of the histories of the Old Dispensation if he should fancy the Saint has indulged in a somewhat fanciful interpretation in a single instance.

St. Augustine's Latin is very easy reading for any scholar who is sufficiently advanced to take a B.A. degree at Oxford, but whatever difficulties may be found in this treatise are amply provided for in the notes and explanations added at the end of the volume. We must, however, express our regret that the editor, in speaking of St. Augustine's teaching on the perpetual virginity of St. Mary and the variation of opinion on the subject, should not have added that this doctrine is *de fide*.

An Introduction to the History of the Church of England from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. By H. O. WAKEMAN.
(London: Rivington, Percival, and Co., 1896.)

THE cordial reception which this volume has met with is surely a hopeful sign of the times. It shows that a great number of readers

are capable of appreciating a composition characterized by purity and brilliancy of style, great breadth of view combined with strong and uncompromising Churchmanship, and a brave outspokenness on the most burning questions. It adds to the significance of the work that it is written by a layman and an Oxford don. It is idle to say that High Churchmanship is only another name for clericalism, or that the Church has lost her hold upon our Universities, when such a layman and such a University teacher as Mr. Wakeman can write as he does. It is, however, too late in the day to recommend a book which has, we are glad to see, passed so soon after its publication into a third edition; we must content ourselves with briefly pointing out its scope and some of its most conspicuous merits, and venturing with great diffidence to mention some things which are in our opinion open to improvement. And, first, we must observe that it is not, as it is described on the back of the volume, 'A History of the Church of England,' but, as it is described on the title-page, 'An *Introduction to the History of the Church of England*. Mr. Wakeman would, we are sure, be the last person in the world to maintain that his volume contained all things necessary even for 'the general reader' of Church history. The book ought, and was doubtless intended, to act as an incentive to him to investigate the subject further. Thus it by no means supersedes the necessity of a fuller history of a popular kind, which, in spite of all that has been written, seems to us still to be a *desideratum*. Archdeacon Perry's *Student's English Church History*, though admirable of its kind, and distinguished by the greatest accuracy and a very remarkable power of condensation, hardly meets the case; for 'the student' and 'the general reader' are different personages. The latter is apt to rebel against the notion that he is to go to school or to college again, which is *his* idea of 'a student.' Hence, perhaps, what is called 'the Student's Hume,' though the work of a great historical scholar, Dr. Brewer, has never been so popular with the general reader as it richly deserves to be. Again, those Church Histories which have arisen out of the vagaries of the Liberation Society, and which are in effect magnified Church Defence tracts, are too obviously written for a purpose—and a very laudable purpose—to supply the want. 'The general reader' does not desire to be in a perpetual state of warfare—to see giants raised up for the express purpose of being immediately knocked down. And as for the older histories, they are necessarily out of date; for there is no subject on which more fresh light has been thrown by recent research than the subject of Church History. At the late Church Congress at Shrewsbury, when a deluded gentleman quoted Bishop Vowler Short as a recognized authority on Church History, it was not thought necessary even to answer him—except by laughter. Mr. Wakeman is thoroughly up to date; and, as a brilliant and fascinating *sketch* of the general outlines of Church History, we do not see how his work can be improved upon. He almost invariably seizes upon the salient points, observes the strictest proportion, and makes the most shrewd and apposite comments; his accuracy in detail is another question, which will be touched on presently. But his work

is a
not
fill u
for
the
Rev
appo
whic
deep
what
mea
One
thre
amp
he
agre
such
they
disse
that
Colle
recog
acco
thos
gene
the l
T
num
in th
we p
early
name
berh
If w
favou
affor
Thes
Agai
the
cient
beard
rather
with
espec
purel
acco
ment
tion
anyth

is a sketch, not an elaborate drawing—an 'Introduction to History,' not 'a History—and we have still to cry, *Exoriare aliquis*, who can fill up the outlines, and write the History, not on too large a scale, for 'the general reader.'

Mr. Wakeman is, to our mind, at his best when he is writing on the English Reformation, and on Methodism and the Evangelical Revival, especially Methodism; while, strange to say, the most disappointing part of his work is his account of that movement with which he is most in sympathy, and which has evidently affected him most deeply. He calls it 'the Oxford Movement,' meaning thereby not what Dean Church means, and what we should suppose most people mean, but the whole advance of the Church from 1833 to 1896. One would have thought that the very interesting personalities of the three great leaders, Keble, Pusey, and Newman, would have afforded ample scope for Mr. Wakeman's unrivalled descriptive powers, but he touches all three, especially Newman, very lightly. We quite agree with Mr. Wakeman's plan of giving only a passing notice to such men as Ward, Oakeley, and Manning, who, however eminent they may have been in other ways, did little service, and not a little disservice, to the Church of England; but we *should* have thought that men like Charles Marriott, William Palmer (of Worcester College), and J. B. Mozley might have claimed a word of grateful recognition (which they do not here receive) in ever so brief an account of the Movement. Again, we desiderate in this last chapter those philosophical estimates and most sensible comments and general reflections which delighted us so much in the chapters on the Reformation and on Methodism.

Turning now to details, we must confess that there is a very large number of passages in the book to which we have put a query; and, in the case of such a writer, it will be more modest and becoming if we put our criticism in the form of queries. We begin with a very early period of the work. Is not the spelling of the Early English names rather arbitrary? We can understand 'Ethelbert' or 'Æthelberht,' but is not 'Æthelbert' (p. 11 and *passim*) rather a mixture? If we can afford to lose our old friends 'Alfred' and 'Edward' in favour of 'Ælfred' and 'Eadward,' might we not have still more easily afforded to lose the less familiar 'Bertha' in favour of 'Bercta'? These are only specimens of many like cases; *ex uno disce omnes*. Again, did not the dying Bede 'breathe forth' the *Gloria Patri*, not the '*Gloria in excelsis Deo*' (p. 53)? Has Mr. Wakeman quite sufficiently emphasized the amazing audacity of the young Wilfrid in bearding his elders at the Council of Whitby' (p. 33)? Is it not rather curious to begin the chapter on the Norman Conquest (p. 76) with the reign of Edward—we beg pardon, Eadward—the Confessor, especially as that chapter contains a vivid account of the triumphs of the purely English and Anti-Norman Godwine and Harold (p. 79)? In the account of Anselm might we not have expected at least some little mention of his literary work? The reader who derived his information solely from Mr. Wakeman would be ignorant that Anselm wrote anything at all; and yet it is not true that Anselm's writings are

infinitely more important than any which had yet come, or which were for ages to come, from any English Churchman (p. 103, &c.)? Is it accurate to say that Reginald Pole died 'within a few days of Queen Mary' (p. 310)? Did they not both die on the same day, November 17, 1558, Mary at 7 A.M. and Pole at 7 P.M.? Is not 'Perry' a misprint for 'Penry' on p. 349? Was 'the learned Dr. Pococke ejected' (we presume from Childrey) 'by the Berkshire committee as insufficient' (p. 378)? Is it not true that Dr. Owen—we really cannot call him Dean, though he held the deanery of Christ Church—and other Oxonians stopped for very shame the ridiculous proceedings of the ignorant commissioners, and persuaded them to leave the great scholar unmolested? 'Venn did the same [itinerated and preached irregularly] until he became vicar of Huddersfield, but in later life acknowledged his mistake' (p. 449). How does all this agree with the fact that Henry Venn was only thirty-six years of age when he became Vicar of Huddersfield, and that at the age of forty-seven he retired from Huddersfield to the little village of Yelling, where he passed the last twenty-six years of his life?

We put these remarks in the form of queries, but we have not the least doubt as to how the queries should be answered. Mr. Wake-man, as a Church historian, resembles Mr. J. R. Green, as a secular historian; both write most attractively; both are correct on broad, general grounds; but both are apt to make slips in detail.

Religious Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century. By JOHN HUNT, D.D. (London: Gibbings and Co., 1896.)

THIS volume is a continuation of the work published by Dr. Hunt nearly a quarter of a century ago. The earlier volumes, three in number, gave an account of Religious Thought—or rather thought in connexion with religion, for much of it was very *irreligious* thought indeed—from the time of Henry VIII. to the close of the eighteenth century. They contained elaborate analyses of all the books of much importance, and of some of very little importance, on the subject; interspersed with a view of the situation from time to time as it appeared from the standpoint of a liberal theologian with a strong bias against High Church views. From the same standpoint he surveys in the present volume almost all the literature which has appeared in connexion with the exciting and important theological and ecclesiastical questions which have come into discussion during the exceptionally busy century now drawing to its close, making, as before, his comments on the situation from time to time. The value of such a work obviously depends upon the absolute impartiality of the writer. If he has strong predilections in *any* direction it is all but impossible for him to avoid giving a twist, not only to his comments, but even to his analyses, to suit his views. The High Churchman would give a High Church twist, the Low Churchman a Low Church twist, the Roman Catholic a Roman twist, the Dissenter a Dissenting twist; and least of all could a liberal theologian help giving a liberal twist to such a work; for, so far as our reading and experience

go,
goi

not
the
real
criti
of a
conc
are
read
in th
exce
read
that
dilec
resu
only
salt
hunt
the
cent
rema
lectu
after
prea
neve
virtu

I
of ra
decla
giant
mout
refer
the A
that I
'wan
izing
objec
but i
ludic
the e
class
cultur
popu
razor
that

1
Life o
VO

go, no one is more conspicuous for illiberality than your thorough-going liberal.

Dr. Hunt is certainly not an exception to that rule. We have not the least doubt that he applies to himself with perfect sincerity the words of Goethe, 'I do not judge, I only record,' and that he really means what he says when he goes on, 'Some men write critical histories, some philosophical, and others write in the interests of a party; but merely to give premisses, or, at the most, to indicate conclusions, has been the object of the writer of this volume.' These are the opening words of his preface; and he is so anxious that the reader should not forget them that he repeats the same profession in the body of his work (p. 272). But the thing cannot be done, except by a man who can make his mind like a blank sheet of paper, ready to receive any impression which may be stamped upon it; but that is not the state of Dr. Hunt's mind; he has prejudices and predilections as strong as any man. Small blame to him for it; but the result is that the reader must take what he says, even when he is only describing another man's thoughts, with a very large pinch of salt indeed. For instance, Dr. Hunt with praiseworthy industry has hunted up and given a little analysis of the Bampton, the Hulsean, the Boyle, and the Warburtonian Lectures delivered during the century; and almost the only set on which he has any depreciatory remarks to make are Dr. Liddon's Bampton's! The subject of the lectures 'did not afford much scope for originality'; it is 'discussed after the usual fashion of a Bampton Lecturer' (p. 319). Hosts of preachers who have long since passed into obscurity, and some who never emerged *from* obscurity, escape uncensured; but the reader is virtually warned off the most distinguished of them all.

Dr. Pusey is described as having been 'to some extent a defender of rational theology in Germany' (p. 161), which he emphatically declares he never was.¹ Archdeacon Denison is likened to the old giant in the *Pilgrim's Progress*, who 'can now only sit in his cave's mouth grinning at the pilgrims as they go' (p. 174), and that in reference to the subject of the Real Presence—the subject on which the Archdeacon has surely a hundred supporters now for every one that he had fifty years ago. The 'rational element' is said to be 'wanting in Puseyism' (p. 161). If by 'rational' be meant 'rationalizing' it is true enough, not to say a truism; for one of the chief objects of Puseyism (so called) was to stem the tide of Rationalism; but if 'rational' is used in its ordinary sense the statement is ludicrously incorrect; for it was actually one of the weak points of the early Tractarians that they appealed exclusively to the intellectual classes; trained themselves to the finest possible point in Oxford culture, they were rather too 'rational'—that is, intellectual—for the popular mind; like Burke in Parliament, they 'cut blocks with a razor.' What, again, are we to make of the extraordinary statement that Manning was 'one of the best representatives of Tractarian

¹ See his words to Dr. Farrar and letter to Mr. Rose on the subject, *Life of Dr. Liddon*, i. 175-7.

principles' (p. 165)? Why, Manning himself deprecated most truly the title of Tractarian as ever applicable to him. 'I was a Pietist,' he said, 'until I accepted the Tridentine Decrees.'¹ Dr. Hunt has surely been misled by his theory that Tractarianism logically tended to Romanism, of which theory it would be no slight confirmation, if the ultramontane Cardinal-priest, Archbishop, and acknowledged leader of the Roman Catholics in England had really been a leading Tractarian; but that was just what he never had been.

So far we have been considering those points on which Dr. Hunt seems to have been led astray by his predilections; but there are other mistakes which are attributable to another source. It is rather unfortunate that a work dealing so largely with Oxford and Cambridge men should have been written by a graduate of St. Andrews. An Oxonian or a Cantab. would, let us hope, never have made such slips as the following: Mark Pattison is said to have been *Master* of Lincoln (p. 387), instead of *Rector*; we hear of Queen's College, Cambridge (p. 382), instead of *Queens'*, as the foundation of the two Queens, Margaret of Anjou and Elizabeth of York, ought to be called. How the distinction between Magdalen, Oxford, and Magdalene, Cambridge, arose we do not know; but Cambridge men are very tenacious about the final 'e,' which Dr. Hunt omits (p. 384). The most distinguished living alumnus of 'the House' will be startled at finding himself described as having been 'educated at Christ Church College, Oxford' (p. 372); 'Arthur Haddan' is so much a household word among Oxonians of a past generation that it will grate upon them to find the name spelt by Dr. Hunt 'Haddon' (p. 217). There was surely never a Bampton Lecturer called Goddard (p. 300), but there *was* one called Goddard in 1823; Henry Manning was never 'Fellow of *Lincoln*' (p. 380), but he *was* Fellow of *Merton*; John Davison, the famous Fellow of Oriel, was never 'Vicar of Satterton in Lincolnshire' (p. 369), for the excellent reason that there is no such place; but he was Vicar of *Sutterton*; the present distinguished Bishop of London is not '*Michael*' (p. 398), but '*Mandell* Creighton,' as every Oxford man has known for many years. One or two other slips occur which cannot be attributed to either of the causes mentioned above. It is difficult to see how Hugh James Rose could have answered Rowland Williams's essay in *Essays and Reviews* (p. 215), seeing that Mr. Rose died in 1838 and the *Essays and Reviews* did not appear until 1860; the mistake arose, no doubt, from the fact that two brothers had the same initials; it was Henry John, not Hugh James, Rose who answered Dr. Williams. It is, of course, a mere slip of the pen or of the printer which gives us 'En! sacrum codicen' (p. 394), instead of 'codicem,' but the misprint swells the number of errors, which are already too numerous. It may be said truly that many of them are of no great importance, but it is of the essence of a book of reference that it should be scrupulously accurate. Dr. Hunt's book is of value simply as a book of reference; it would be as difficult to read it through

¹ Quoted in Purcell's *Life*, i. 109.

cons
the
exce
glad
inac

Stua

THE
the n
marc
from
and
seize
the w
where
Card
where
be fl
are t
marc
it is
the d
towar
Tynd
enjoy
Of th
which
men,
of El
lucid
was i
No E
words
biogr

'T
Swift,
truly,
friend
see th
perha
easy n
pulse,
pointe
a good

Of the
her' (

'W
one ca
for; t

conscientiously as it would be to read Johnson's Dictionary. That the writer has taken great pains, and done a work which will be exceedingly useful to the student of the theology of the past, we gladly admit; but that it is done without prejudice and without inaccuracy we cannot allow.

Studies of Men. By GEORGE W. SMALLEY. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1895.)

THESE biographical *Studies*, as we are told, 'appeared originally for the most part in the *New York Tribune*. The Visit to Prince Bismarck is reprinted from the *Fortnightly Review*.' Mr. Smalley writes from personal knowledge of many of the persons whom he describes, and he writes cleverly, pithily, and amusingly, always managing to seize upon some one or more points which bring out the strength or the weakness of the characters. He is more successful, in our opinion, when he writes of statesmen than when he considers divines like Cardinal Newman or Mr. Spurgeon; for he is at his ease in politics, whereas he is prejudiced against theology as such, and is inclined to be flippant in sacred things. By far the best papers in this collection are those which describe the home and conversation of Prince Bismarck—they are full of pleasant chat about persons and things; but it is plain that the writer has allowed himself to be carried away by the discontent of the ex-Chancellor, and to become unnecessarily harsh towards the young German Emperor. Lord Tennyson, Professor Tyndall, and Mrs. Humphry Ward, are studies which every reader will enjoy, both for their fun and their serious estimate of these characters. Of the first Mr. Smalley says: 'The true note in Tennyson, that which, apart from his poetic genius, endeared him to his countrymen, was the note of heroic patriotism.' 'He was an Englishman of Elizabeth's days.' 'He hated the peace-at-any-price people.' 'His lucid simplicity was as admirable as it was characteristic.' 'Tennyson was in literature the supreme artist of his time and of his own country. No Englishman of his day has so perfectly understood the use of words' (pp. 70, 71, 72, 73). Of the second, in an appreciative biography, he says:

'Tyndall could be interesting on a dry subject, or, as was said of Swift, write well about a broomstick, or, as was said of Dickens, less truly, about a three-legged stool. Like Carlyle, of whom he was a near friend, he had the secret of seeing things vividly and of making others see them vividly. Like Carlyle also, he was a born fighter. He had perhaps a knack of getting into controversies, and was not always an easy man to work with. The public profited by this taste or this impulse, or whatever it was. He was admirable as a disputant; luminous, pointed, convincing; and not less convincing with a bad case than with a good one' (p. 171).

Of the third Mr. Smalley truly says: 'Her sympathies run away with her' (p. 228).

'Whether Mrs. Ward ever consciously tries to be amusing or not, one can only guess. But to try is fatal. Spontaneity is what one longs for; that she should let herself go, and see what comes of it. At

times she does, but not in this direction. The gift of humour does not come to her by nature' (p. 232).

There is no end to the good things which Mr. Smalley has to say about his characters. Sometimes he hits them off exactly, e.g. Mr. Balfour and Lord Randolph Churchill; at other times he touches only the fringe—e.g. Lord Rosebery and Cardinal Newman; especially when he attributes the influence of the latter chiefly to 'his literary work,' calling him 'a master of English prose,' and yet saying that he wrote 'no great work, no single book that can be called great, unless the *Apologia* be an exception' (p. 6). We could go on a long while picking out delightful bits from these *Studies*, but we must conclude with two passages, the former of which gives a charming picture of the late Duke of Devonshire, and the latter may serve to correct some popular views of Sir William Harcourt's character.

(1) 'Pathetic indeed in latter years—pathetic and sympathetic—was the figure of the Duke as he sat at the head of the long table in the great dining-room at Chatsworth. His grave, strong face, the crown of white hair which fell carelessly over the high, broad forehead, the eyes alive and alight with a fire that seemed still young, the dignity, the beautiful, quiet distinction of manner, the stamp of intellect on the features, the bearing which had all the courtesy of an earlier century and was not the less stately for the bent head and the slight stoop—all these traits gave to him the air of one of the portraits by Titian or Van Dyck which hung hard by. He was as alert in mind as ever, his faculties clear, his judgment firm and sober and sound. His simplicity was that of the *grand seigneur*, and so was his genuineness; never in his life had he felt called upon to seem to be something he was not' (pp. 50, 51).

(2) 'He has humour and good-humour, tact and sympathy, and these are qualities which are invaluable. Of old time he was thought to have a temper which blazed somewhat fiercely when stirred. If he ever had it he probably still has it, but it is under control, and nothing is more useful than a temper under control. He is not merciful in debate. . . . Of malice there is never a trace; it is all honest, hearty, outspoken, and manly. No one is more genial, no one has more surprises, no one more varied conversation, and no one asserts a more just supremacy amid a company of his fellow-men' (p. 224).

This is certainly not the popular view; we hope it is an accurate judgment. Mr. Smalley is in error when he says 'he was Professor of International Law at Oxford' (p. 218), for that honour belonged to the sister university; but at one time Sir William represented the city of Oxford in Parliament; perhaps this may account for the mistake.

Practical Reflections on every Verse of the Minor Prophets. By a Clergyman. With a Preface by the Right Rev. EDWARD KING, D.D., Lord Bishop of Lincoln. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896.)

Two years ago, in a Short Notice of the *Practical Reflections on every Verse of the Prophet Isaiah* (October 1894), we suggested that the Minor Prophets should be similarly treated, because of the great

1897

diffic
are g
regre
serie
of th
laity
time
thes
tive
of th
'I
impr
man
God
arch
Law
religi
mora
the
'due
the s
social
has
Minor
use o
for th
reuni
they
of Fa
the M
study
theolo
shoul
At
Twelv
proph
upon
The li
is ope
e.g. w
1 Cor
1 St. I
might
printe
why n
But as
multip
As
passag
viz: (

difficulty of this portion of the Bible to the English reader, and we are glad to find that it has been done, and done so well. Our only regret is that the present is to be the 'concluding volume' of the series; but we must be grateful for the help afforded by the compiler of these *Practical Reflections* both to the clergy and to the devout laity. The priest who feels it his duty to expound to his people from time to time the more difficult parts of the Bible will never turn to these volumes in vain, not, indeed, for critical exegesis, but for suggestive hints as to the application of every text of Scripture to the needs of the soul.

The Bishop of Lincoln's thoughtful preface to this volume impresses upon us that the Bible is a chief means of bringing back man to God and to his fellow-men. The process is gradual, just as God's revelation of His will has been gradual; but from the Patriarchal age we are meant to learn 'personal responsibility,' from the Law the necessity of obedience, from the Psalms the development of religious affections, and from the Prophets 'the application of the moral law, not only to individuals, but to society' (p. viii). During the last fifty years the revival of Church life has taught us to give 'due place to the heart and affections,' and to express our feelings in the singing of psalms; we have learned, too, something more about social duties and Christian ethics, and that Old Testament prophecy has 'a living message for the Christian Church' (pp. ix-xi). The Minor Prophets have an important bearing on Gospel times, as the use of them in the New Testament shows; they are a preparation for the study of Church History; they offer suggestions for the reunion and triumph of the Church (pp. xii-xiv). And, besides this, they exhibit two safeguards of personal religion, viz. (1) the condition of Faith (Habak. ii. 4), and (2) the condition of individual loyalty to the Moral Law (Micah vi. 8). The whole preface is well worthy of study; it sums up the most recent utterances of the best English theologians. There is, however, a misprint on p. xiii, where '(p. ix)' should be '(p. xxi).'

After the preface follow two notes—one upon the order of the Twelve Prophets, where we are glad to find Jonah regarded as a prophetic book, and dated in the eighth century B.C.; the other upon the use made of the Minor Prophets in the New Testament. The list of references and quotations is a long one (pp. xxi-xxvi), and is open to some objections on the score of exaggeration and omission; e.g. we doubt whether Hosea vi. 3 can be said to be 'referred to in 1 Cor. xv. 3,' or Malachi iii. 7 [? 17] to be 'quoted (LXX) in 1 St. Peter ii. 9'; and we should have thought that St. Mark iv. 29 might have been cited, along with Revelation xiv. (not 'xv.' as printed on p. xxii), as reproducing the language of Joel iii. 13; and why not add St. Matt. xvii. 10, 11, as a reference to Malachi iv. 6? But as this list is not the main purpose of the book, we need not multiply objections, though we have found many.

As examples of the method of interpretation we shall quote two passages, one from the earlier, the other from the later, prophecies, viz.: (1) on Amos ii. 6, 7, 8.

'Israel is the main object of the Prophet's warnings. He sees there injustice, oppression, foulness, a show of religion covering wrong. Under the name of Israel the Prophet addresses not the Ten Tribes only, out Catholic Christians. It is the Church of God in all ages that he has in view. He scourges our contempt for humble souls, our depravation of religious names to party strife, our corruption of Divine Truth by mixing it with our own inventions. Scripture insists upon the rights and dignity of the poor, the worth of each believing soul, the sham of religious phrases without reality. The religion that prevailed in Israel permitted its professors to cheat, to oppress, to turn worship into sin' (p. 61).

This is a good specimen of the way in which the teaching of the prophets can be applied to the morals of to-day in a terse, brief comment. The other example concerns the Christian ministry equally with the Jewish, viz. : (2) on Malachi ii. 7.

'How shall the priest teach but by learning daily from God? How shall he expound God's law unless he has studied it? How can he be a messenger from God unless he has ascended in mind to God's Throne, and thence obtained the message he is to bring? Let this verse be ever in the memory of God's ministers to recall to them the need of learning as well as teaching. If priests demand to be honoured as ambassadors of God, they ought themselves to honour their Prince and devote themselves to His concerns. Let it be their desire to find out what is God's message for this or that heart, and, when found, to deliver it faithfully' (p. 205).

The Life of Sir Henry Halford, Bart., G.C.H., M.D., F.R.S., President of the Royal College of Physicians, &c. By WILLIAM MUNK, M.D., F.S.A., Fellow and late Vice-President of the Royal College of Physicians of London. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1895.)

THE biography of a man, however famous in his generation, written after he has been dead more than half a century, cannot be expected to appeal to the general public with the same force and interest as one written by and for his contemporaries. The present volume must, therefore, fall somewhat flat, although it has been executed with great care and skill by one who holds Sir Henry Halford's name in high esteem, both for his private character and for his professional reputation. The present generation, if Sir Henry Halford is to it anything more than a name as a Court physician during the reigns of George III., George IV., and William IV., probably thinks of him as the most elegant writer of Latin prose and verse among a well-educated and scholarly race of medical men. But for the purposes of the College of Physicians it was most desirable that there should be an authorized memoir of so eminent a president of that society as Sir Henry Halford, and Dr. Munk has carried out his task with great conscientiousness and evidently with thorough admiration of his subject. Perhaps he has given us a little too much of the correspondence and the professional relations between the physician and the various members of the Royal Family, but at least the letters bring out the high character of Sir Henry under circumstances which might have been dangerous for a man of a less upright and sincere disposition.

of a
Sir
and
Hal
cont
year
Dr.
sch
remo
(178
his v
he w
M.D
Leic
and
phys
of ag
ried
prac
pers
men
in r
it re
succ
fami
T
Sir
of th
inter
know
from
1823
men
to a
(pp.
and
to m
(pp.
juni
degr
vote
ing c
that
I
his
excl
his a
pow
(p. 2

Sir Henry Halford, Bart., was originally Henry Vaughan, son of an eminent doctor at Leicester, who had married a daughter of Sir Richard Halford, Bart., of Wistow, in the county of Leicester, and by the death of his elder brother, Henry, became heir to the Halford estates. His education began at Rugby (1774), and was continued at Christ Church, Oxford (1781), he being only fifteen years old at his matriculation; he studied medicine at Oxford under Dr. Martin Wall, and was regarded as 'a very elegant and graceful scholar,' being specially devoted to the classics. From Oxford he removed to Edinburgh, and worked there (p. 17) for three sessions (1786-9), chemistry and anatomy being his favourite studies, and his well-filled note-books yet show how diligent a medical student he was. He took his Master's degree at Oxford in 1788 and his M.D. in 1791, and after practising for a while with his father at Leicester and for one season at Scarborough, he went to London, and soon was made physician to the Middlesex Hospital (1793), physician extraordinary to the King before he was twenty-seven years of age, and Fellow of the College of Physicians (1794). He was married in 1795, and delivered the Harveian oration in 1800. His practice grew and grew, he being consulted by all the most noted persons of the day, including the Royal Family, bishops, and statesmen, and his income, which in 1792 was only 220*l.*, rose to 1,403*l.* in 1799, and became 9,850*l.* in 1809, at which figure or thereabouts it remained until his death in 1844. By the death of his father he succeeded (1814) to the Halford property, having already taken the family name on being created a baronet in 1809.

Two events are to be specially remembered in connexion with Sir Henry Halford's name, viz. (1) the discovery and identification of the body of King Charles I., the account of which is particularly interesting, and was written by Sir Henry himself from personal knowledge (pp. 53-62); (2) the removal of the College of Physicians from Warwick Lane to Pall Mall East, between the years 1814 and 1825. Sir Henry had been made president in 1820, and was instrumental in bringing this important event in the history of the college to a successful issue. The account of the opening is very dignified (pp. 111-5), and the evening meetings which were then instituted, and which were carried on for the next thirteen years, gave occasion to many learned treatises, and brought together a brilliant company (pp. 115-21). The president met with one great difficulty from his juniors in the college when he strove to keep up the University degree as a necessary qualification for a fellowship, but he was outvoted in 1835, and Dr. Munk does well to comment upon the lowering of the general culture of physicians which has followed upon that defeat (p. 123-8).

In estimating Sir Henry Halford's worth Dr. Munk dwells upon his 'power of fixing his attention on the subject before him, to the exclusion of other thought, or of distractions of any kind' (p. 258); his accurate knowledge of drugs (p. 260); his 'confidence in the power of nature to cure disease—in the *vis medicatrix nature*' (p. 261); his ability to inspire hope in his patients (p. 264); his

consistent advocacy of vaccination (pp. 50-2, 269); his facility of speaking Latin (p. 273); his promptness in acknowledging a mistake into which quickness of temper and hastiness of speech often betrayed him (p. 278); his religious habits, especially the daily reading of the Greek Testament (p. 283). But perhaps the most striking point in his professional career was his justification of his conduct in regard to the last illness of George IV. in an elegant essay *On the Influence of some Diseases of the Body on the Mind* (1831), in which he sets forth the principles upon which he would act in withholding from the patient the knowledge of his condition (pp. 178-84). From this essay we make one short quotation, but the whole is well worth reading.

'I own, I think it my first duty to protract his life by all practicable means, and to interpose myself between him and everything which may possibly aggravate his danger. And unless I shall have found him averse from doing what was necessary in aid of my remedies, from a want of a proper sense of his perilous situation, I forbear to step out of the bounds of my province in order to offer any advice which is not necessary to promote his cure. At the same time, I think it indispensable to let his friends know the danger of his case the instant I discover it' (pp. 178-9).

We do not know whether Sir Henry or his biographer is responsible for 'Hippocrates, *περι ενσχημοσυνής*' (p. 181), but the accentuation as it is, or the absence of it, greatly offends the eye.

Ten Years in a Portsmouth Slum. By ROBERT R. DOLLING, late Priest-in-Charge of St. Agatha's, Landport. (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1896.)

THIS book presents a thoroughly interesting record of arduous work carried on with untiring patience, great vigour, and true manliness, together with an intense belief in the power of the cross of Christ. No one who reads this account of the Winchester College Mission can fail to learn what great things the Church of England might achieve in any of our large cities if only she were equipped with a staff of earnest clergy and lay workers, with adequate funds, and suitable buildings. We may not admire all Mr. Dolling's methods, but we can appreciate his self-devotion, his indomitable energy, his wonderful attractiveness among the very poorest, and his strong personal influence over the young. The remarkable features of his ministry in spiritual things appear to be (1) the open way in which confession was taught and practised, without any apparent hindrance from his people; (2) the desire and exercise of prayer on the part of the very simplest; (3) the power of the Eucharistic intercession which was constantly maintained at St. Agatha's. Of course the really lamentable feature in the whole ten years' work was the missionary's attitude towards his diocesan. Under Bishops Harold Browne and Thorold there was a certain degree of tension, but under their successor, the present Bishop of Winchester, things came to a climax. The whole correspondence between the Bishop and Mr. Dolling is printed at the end of this volume, and those who will

read
show
himse
peopl
tion
and
do w
any
spoke
Bish
Doll
pay
unde
no p
of his
press

New

ADM
addit
can s
high
simpl
gathe
from
contr
subje
187-
The
trated
above
and
patho
the p
(pp. 2
ones,
ness
(pp.
patho
The
the re
the p
Mr. V
his sis

'It
the p
expect
in cor

read it must perceive how careful and considerate the diocesan showed himself, while the missionary, though candid with the Bishop himself, was not equally so in his public utterances before his own people. It must always be remembered that Mr. Dolling's resignation had been offered and accepted before the final troubles began, and that, therefore, the Bishop's demands had nothing whatever to do with the resignation itself; for that would have taken effect in any case. Mr. Dolling, however, did not make this clear when he spoke in public at Portsmouth. Afterwards he apologized to the Bishop, and, the incident being now over, we heartily wish Mr. Dolling good success in the effort which he is making honourably to pay off the debt upon the mission buildings which had been incurred under his ministry. The publication of this volume, although it has no pretensions to literary merit, may induce some who read the story of his self-denying work to help to lighten the heavy burden that still presses upon him.

New Poems by Christina Rossetti, hitherto unpublished or uncollected. Edited by WILLIAM MICHAEL ROSSETTI. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1896.)

ADMIRERS of Christina Rossetti's poetry will be glad to possess this additional volume, which has been edited by her brother, though it can scarcely add to her merits as a writer who had already earned a high degree of fame both for her devotional spirit and her charming simplicity. The poems contained in this new volume have been gathered from seventeen little note-books, dated 1842 to 1866, and from various periodicals and magazines to which they were once contributed. They have been arranged in four groups, according to subject or date, viz. 1, general (pp. 3-184); 2, devotional (pp. 187-265); 3, Italian (pp. 269-302); and 4, Juvenilia (pp. 305-75). The general characteristics of Christina Rossetti's poems as illustrated in this volume, besides the devotional spirit and simplicity above mentioned, are brightness, freshness and vigour, playfulness and humour, together with a deep sadness, an intense faith, a real pathos, true reverence, and a delight in natural beauty. Probably the poems which will attract most attention will be 'The Three Nuns' (pp. 27-35) and 'The Dead City' (pp. 342-53) among the longer ones, the former for its insight into character, the latter for its weirdness and romance; while among the shorter ones 'Cousin Kate' (pp. 127-9) and 'Sister Maude' (pp. 129-30), the one for its pathos, the other for its passion, will be sure to delight the reader. The 'Notes' (pp. 377-97) will be found most helpful in guiding the reader to the meaning of any allusions to persons or events in the poems, and in suggesting the occasions of their composition. Mr. W. M. Rossetti has written a loving and appreciative preface to his sister's poetry, from which we select the following passage:—

'It is for the reader to form his own opinion whether the contents of the present volume are good, bad, or indifferent. But he may perhaps expect me to give some intimation as to the value which I attach to them, in comparison with those poems which my sister saw fit to publish

during her lifetime. Let me, then, say briefly that I conceive *some* of the compositions herein contained to be up to the level of Christina Rossetti's best work, and the great majority of them to be well up to her average' (p. xi).

The Christian's Roadbook. Part II. Readings. By ANTHONY BATHE, Vicar of Fridaythorpe, Yorkshire, and F. H. BUCKHAM, Vicar of Sledmere, Yorkshire; with an Introduction by W. J. KNOX LITTLE, M.A., Canon of Worcester. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896.)

THE second part of this little manual consists of seventeen Readings, which are intended to be used three times a year on Sundays, and a special one is provided for the last Sunday in December. The idea is a good one; and, as the language is simple and homely, and the statements of Christian doctrine and practice are largely based upon Holy Scripture, the Readings are likely to be useful, especially for persons who cannot go to church regularly. The subjects dealt with are Creation, Redemption, Sanctification, the Church, Prayer, Sin, Repentance, Holy Communion, the Theological Virtues, and the last six Commandments. Canon Knox Little in his Introduction speaks of the Readings with approval, saying, 'They seem to me to be plain and practical, and to deal, in a simple and straightforward way, with the great teachings of the Church on Religion and Morality.' We are satisfied, for the most part, with the teaching that is given, especially upon the cardinal truths of the Christian Faith, and the moral teaching—*e.g.* upon the seventh Commandment, is much to be commended; but we cannot endorse the position that is taken up in regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, because it is insisted that attendance at the offering of the 'Holy Eucharist' is quite a separate duty from the reception of the 'Holy Communion' (*vide* Readings for the tenth and eleventh Sundays and *passim*). The importance of being 'present' at the celebration of the Eucharist, without any intention of communicating, is strongly urged (pp. 36, 53, 54, 106, 107, and 110), as if it were enough for the Sunday worship with only occasional reception. We do not intend to argue here whether non-communicating attendance be or be not permissible under certain conditions, but at least the Book of Common Prayer does not separate 'communion' from 'the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,' as this manual does. Such teaching, therefore, appears to us to be dangerous, especially to the young and the ignorant, for whose instruction, presumably, these Readings were composed. It is also implied (pp. 105, 106) that upon Good Friday no celebration of the Holy Communion (or, rather, no offering of the Holy Eucharist) is permissible, which is, to say the least, a strange position in the face of the English Prayer Book, which makes no difference between Good Friday and the other days of the week before Easter in this respect. Any simple student of our Prayer Book would feel that there was great exaggeration in the attitude of these two writers towards the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist, which is not warranted by the English Liturgy. For their other teaching we are most grateful.

ARCHD
to no p
descrip
book is
written
in the
handy
their li
if impa
want.
in the
have b
it. Th
on the
be put
they ar
supply
of kno
fall int
—the

We
colour
well as
satisfac
Casau
Leslie
writers
views
with g
knowle
No ma
men h
unless
Cranm
Newm
us in
ploded
centur
of tho
pass;
certain
friend
Latim
serious
deacon
real co
inclus

Leaders of Thought in the English Church. By W. M. SINCLAIR, Archdeacon of London, &c. (London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.)

ARCHDEACON SINCLAIR describes himself in his Preface as 'belonging to no party' (p. ix), but the contents of his book hardly bear out this description. In fact, what might have been an interesting and useful book is somewhat spoilt by the vehement party-spirit in which it is written. To select twelve men as representative leaders of thought in the English Church, and to compress within the compass of one handy volume all that is needful for the general reader to know about their lives, characters, and writings, was a most laudable project, and if impartially, as well as ably, carried out, might have supplied a real want. 'When I was beginning,' writes the author, 'ministerial life in the Church, I am certain that some such collection as this would have been useful to myself' (Pref. p. viii); and we can well believe it. The twelve leaders might act as twelve guide-posts to the traveller on the road of Church History; but it is essential for guide-posts to be put in the right places, and to indicate the right way; otherwise they are worse than useless. If Archdeacon Sinclair has failed in supplying trusty guidance, it is certainly not from lack of ability or of knowledge; he writes in a clear and scholarly style, and does not fall into mistakes of fact; if he misleads, it is from sheer party-spirit—the very spirit which he disclaims.

We should not at all object to such a work as that before us being colourless. A man might be 'indifferent,' in the unfavourable as well as in the favourable sense of the term, and yet do his work satisfactorily. We have instances in Mr. Mark Pattison's *Life of Casaubon*, in Mr. Cotter Morrison's *Life of St. Bernard*, and in Mr. Leslie Stephen's sketch of *William Law*. All these three very able writers would differ from our views as widely as they differ from the views of their respective heroes; and yet we can accept their work with gratitude, simply because, in addition to great abilities and knowledge, they show great impartiality. Not so Archdeacon Sinclair. No man of his ability and knowledge would have selected the twelve men he has chosen as leaders of thought in the English Church, unless he had been biassed by the spirit of party. His leaders are: Cranmer, Latimer, Laud, Hooker, Butler, Waterland, Wesley, Simeon, Newman, Pusey, Arnold, and Tait. Now, the first thing that strikes us in this choice is, that the Archdeacon appears to hold the exploded theory that the English Church was a creation of the sixteenth century; for not one word is said about the existence of any leaders of thought in the English Church before that period. But let that pass; let also the selection of Cranmer pass, though we should certainly have supposed that, as a leader of *thought*, Cranmer's friend Ridley had a prior claim. But what shall we say of 'honest Latimer' as 'a leader of thought'? Can Archdeacon Sinclair seriously think that Latimer's 'rodomontades,' as his brother archdeacon, Perry, irreverently calls the memorable sermons, were any real contribution to *thought*? Was not the real reason of Latimer's inclusion simply that he was a vehement party-man, which the Arch-

deacon asserts that he himself is not? Nor should we quite call Laud a leader of *thought*; though we can quite understand his inclusion, on the same principle on which Latimer is included; but in Laud's case it is in the way of warning rather than of example; he is cited as a notable instance of 'how *not* to do it.' The claims of the next three—Hooker, Butler, and Waterland—are indisputable; they all stand in the very highest rank among the leaders of thought in the English Church. But we take a tremendous leap from Hooker to Butler over more than a century, and that by far the most brilliant century in the whole course of English Church History. The Caroline period has been termed the golden age of English theology, but Archdeacon Sinclair entirely ignores it. Barrow, South, Hammond, Thorndike, Pearson, Jeremy Taylor, Walton, Cosin, Gunning, Ken, Beveridge, Patrick, Stillingfleet—was there not one among them who deserved a place among the Twelve? No! for aught that appears to the contrary, the whole of that era which, above any other, made 'clerus Anglicanus stupor mundi,' was an absolute blank! And then, John Wesley, of all men in the world, appears as a leader of thought! Wesley, of whom it is exceedingly difficult to say *what* he thought! Wesley, who can be quoted—and without unfairness—by men like Canon Hockin on the one side, and Dr. Rigg on the other, simply because he was the most inconsistent of thinkers! What well-trained divine ever dreamed for a moment of appealing to John Wesley as an authority in the domain of thought, or, for the matter of that, to the next name on the list, Charles Simeon? As earnest, self-denying men, who exercised a vast influence over thousands, they both deserve a high place in Christian biography, but as thinkers they were nowhere. Newman and Pusey seem to be included on the same principle on which Laud is included. To pursue a metaphor we have used before, they are placed on the road, not as guide-posts, but as 'terricula' to the traveller; just as in the old days, gibbets, with their ghastly burdens hanging in chains, used to be set by the wayside. And, finally, we should never have selected, in our wildest day-dreams, Dr. Arnold and Archbishop Tait as leaders of *thought*. Both were fine characters, and both did good work in their proper spheres—and not a little mischief when they went out of their spheres; but as representative thinkers of that very miscellaneous school of theology termed 'liberal,' surely such men as Whately, Thirlwall, and a dozen others ranked far before them. The Archdeacon himself seems to have an inkling of the absurdity of his last selection, and makes a sort of apology for it in his Preface. Space forbids us to enter into the details of this work; but we gladly own, in conclusion, that though the author appears to us to be a very strong partisan, he writes in a kindly spirit, and sincerely strives to do justice to what he regards as the good points of those from whom he widely differs. That he also writes with considerable ability, goes without saying.

THE
little
of the
fash
sch
and
and
biog
pup
high
ant
Pro
lent
fuls
and
sion
seve
eray
ing
extr
pub
tion
test
that
refo
give
grea

unw
fash
it ra
was
a re
and
sure

hea
glac
Hay
anc
ing
fine
and
pup
drea
was
dou
you

Memoir of Dr. Hawtrey. By F. ST. JOHN THACKERAY. (London : George Bell and Sons, 1896.)

THERE is something, to our mind, exceedingly refreshing in this little Memoir, furnishing, as it does, an agreeable contrast to many of the *fin-de-siècle* notions now prevalent. Dr. Hawtrey was an old-fashioned scholar, with old-fashioned ideas both of religion and of school government ; without any 'advanced views' in any direction, and simply content to do his duty in that state of life—a very high and important one—unto which it pleased God to call him. His biographer is, most appropriately, one of his own many distinguished pupils, who, having reached the top of the tree at Eton, took the highest honours at Oxford, and then returned to his old school as assistant master in 1858, four years before his old head-master, by that time Provost, died. He tells his story, as might be expected, with excellent taste, in a scholarly, quiet, and unpretentious way, avoiding all fulsome panegyric, and giving full prominence to Hawtrey's foibles and defects, but conveying on the whole a most favourable impression of his hero—an impression amply borne out by the testimony of several very highly distinguished men who have supplied Mr. Thackeray with their recollections of Hawtrey at Eton. It is not surprising to gather from these pages that Etonians rather rebel against the extravagant estimate of the reforms wrought by Dr. Arnold in our public-school system—an estimate which necessarily casts a reflection upon other head-masters. Some years ago Mr. Gladstone protested—and his protest is repeated in this work—against the idea that Eton simply followed in the wake of Rugby in the matter of reform. Mr. Greene, an assistant master at Eton with Mr. Thackeray, gives his testimony on one point, which always struck us as requiring great qualification, in Dean Stanley's *Life of Dr. Arnold* :

'And here let me say that this principle of trusting boys, unless proved unworthy of trust, was well known at Eton. It has been too much the fashion to suppose that Dr. Arnold invented it first and wholly, and that it radiated from Rugby alone. All honour be to Arnold ; wide, no doubt, was his influence for good ; all honour to Rugby, which has been for years a renowned head-master maker. But Etonian masters knew the principle and acted upon it independently of Arnold and Rugby ; Hawtrey, I am sure, so acted of his own judgment and generosity' (p. 156).

We always regarded Dr. Hawtrey, not only as a most successful head-master, but as a true reformer in his own fashion ; and we are glad to find that Mr. Thackeray fully confirms our impression. Hawtrey differed from Arnold in his ways, no less than in his appearance. Arnold, if not actually handsome, was personally both imposing and attractive ; Hawtrey appears to have been—'not to put too fine a point upon it'—positively ugly. Arnold plunged into politics and theology, carrying, either directly or indirectly, his favourite pupils with him ; Hawtrey carefully held aloof from both ; and, dreadful as it may sound, we are not at all sure whether the latter was not the best plan for a schoolmaster to adopt. It is a very doubtful advantage for a boy to become before his time a precocious young theologian, politician, or philosopher ; forming and expressing

opinions upon subjects of which he cannot possibly have any real knowledge. And 'moral thoughtfulness,' to adopt the well-known Rugby phrase, is an excellent quality in itself, but it has a little tendency to degenerate into priggishness. Hawtrey 'taught successfully that truthfulness is the basis of all religion, and of all manliness; he made proverbial the honour of an Eton boy' (p. 214). These are not bad lessons to teach, and when we add that he changed 'the reign of terror' which had existed under Dr. Keate into a reign of love (by comparison); that he abolished, at the cost of much odium and not a little personal expense, the time-honoured, but utterly absurd and mischievous 'Eton Montem'; that he remodelled the forms so as to make each of them manageable by the Form-Master, which it had not been before; that he had the Eton Chapel restored, and made its services more attractive, we have said enough to show that he was anything but a *roi fainéant*. What his own special religious views were, it is difficult to say; he was, of course, incapacitated by his training for any sympathy with the great Church movement which was going on throughout the land when he was at Eton; but 'he became the faithful friend and moderate supporter of several Anglo-Catholic colleagues' (p. 119). He was not 'up to date' in his mode of teaching the classical authors; but there is so much truth in his view of the matter that we cannot resist quoting his own words, uttered in his old age when 'the old order was giving place to new':

'I am inclined to think that there is much less of that comparison of authors during lessons than formerly; more of philology, much less of taste; but then this is the University teaching—when boys go to Oxford or Cambridge now, philology and not taste is set before them as the main object of study. Now, I believe this quenches the fire of poetry and deadens even the feeling for those beauties which were, in old times, so much admired' (p. 204).

It is sad to think that Hawtrey's last days were embittered—if not actually shortened—by the severe criticism to which his beloved Eton was subjected, but it is unnecessary in this place *infandum renovare dolorem*. We will end as we began, by heartily thanking Mr. Thackeray for the charming picture he has given us of his old master and friend.

Thomas Ken. By F. A. CLARKE. *Leaders of Religion Series.* (London: Methuen and Co., 1896.)

THE writer of a new life of Bishop Ken has had to tell, not a twice, but a many times told tale. There are few of our great Churchmen who have been so largely dealt with by historians and biographers. There are already four direct and exclusive biographies, each of them having a special interest of its own. We begin with Ken's own great-nephew, who published the first biography in 1713, only three years after his uncle's death, and who therefore probably gained his information at first hand. Then, in 1830, came a life by Canon Bowles, who commands a certain interest because he is a minor poet writing

abo
som
W
now
of
than
far
Plu
and
four
we
—ol
plac
have
Stri
Chu
over
occu
juro
teen
abou
gati
wha
the
dem
sain
all
ther
them
nonj
Mr.
nonj
sepa
long
of t
Chu
Geor
to li
the
Colli
be c
man
fishe
fishe
Geor

THE
with
foll

about a minor poet, and a Wykehamist writing about a Wykehamist, some of the most interesting events of whose life are connected with Winchester. Then, in 1851, appeared another 'Life,' by a 'Layman,' now known to have been Mr. J. L. Anderdon, which was the result of many years' study and research, and is more full and accurate than either of the preceding biographies. Finally, in 1888, came by far the most exhaustive and elaborate 'Life' of all : that by Dean Plumptre, written under the shadow of Bishop Ken's own cathedral, and gaining a certain inspiration from the *genius loci*. Besides these four professed 'Lives'—all of them accessible and readable enough—we have numerous sketches—some of them very elaborate sketches—of the saintly Bishop. He occupies, of course, a very conspicuous place in the histories of the memorable Seven Bishops, to whom we have two distinct books—both classics—devoted, viz. that of Miss Strickland and that of Dean Luckock. Ken is one of the very few High Churchmen acceptable to Lord Macaulay, who accordingly gushes over him at some length in his (so-called) *History*. He naturally occupies a considerable space in Mr. Lathbury's *History of the Non-jurors* ; and all historians, ecclesiastical and civil, of the later seventeenth and earlier eighteenth centuries have, of course, much to say about him. A new 'Life,' therefore, seems almost a work of supererogation. It can at best do little else than put into a more handy form what has been often said before, and this, it will be said, is all that the series of 'Leaders of Religion' aims at doing. But then we rather demur to the inclusion of Bishop Ken in the series. He was a great saint, but scarcely a great leader. He is perhaps the best known of all the nonjurors, but was never their leader. That post—so far as there *was* such a post—was held, first by Archbishop Sancroft, and then by Bishop Lloyd (of Norwich, not of St. Asaph). With the later nonjurors Ken would, of course, be quite out of sympathy ; and is Mr. Clarke correct in saying that with Ken 'the great body of the nonjurors returned to the communion of the Church' ? (p. 220). The separation (we should hardly call it a schism) not only continued long after the return of Ken, *not* (pace Mr. Clarke) to 'the communion of the Church,' which he never left, but to that of the *National Church*, but it received a considerable accession of numbers when George I. succeeded Queen Anne ; and its most valuable contributions to literature were made after Ken's return. We need only mention the names of Law, Hickeys (to whom Mr. Clarke does scant justice), Collier, Spinckes, and Brett to show this. However, attention cannot be called too often to so pious a Christian and so sound a Churchman as Bishop Ken was, and if Mr. Clarke can catch in his net some fishes which have escaped the meshes of the many others who have fished in the same waters, we heartily wish success to his venture.

George Fox. By THOMAS HODGKIN. *Leaders of Religion Series.* (London : Methuen and Co., 1896.)

THE biography of this extraordinary man is written, on the whole with good taste, candour, and impartiality, by Dr. Hodgkin, who is a follower, but by no means an indiscriminate admirer, of Fox. But,

truth to say, it is an unlovely story which Dr. Hodgkin has to tell. George Fox was simply a fanatic, who succeeded on the one hand in winning over a number of fanatics to adopt his eccentric views and ways; and, on the other hand, in exciting the wrath of other fanatics, who, in the days of their power, persecuted him and his followers most shamefully. After the restoration of the Monarchy this persecution was not one whit relaxed; perhaps it was a little increased, but though Dr. Hodgkin is evidently inclined to think the best of Cromwell and the Protectorate, and the worst of Charles II. and the Monarchy, he is too fair to disguise facts; and the impression left upon the reader is that there was much of a muchness in the treatment of George Fox and his followers under the two *régimes*. It is not Dr. Hodgkin's fault that so large a portion of his hero's life was spent either in wrangling with his enemies or in prison, but the result is that his pages are dreary reading. The book is almost entirely taken up with an account of the real hardships which Fox underwent, and as one hardship was very like another, the repetition of them is both wearisome and depressing. The writer might, we think, having given a few specimens, have presumed that his readers would take the rest for granted, and have filled his allotted space in telling us more of the workings of Fox's own mind. Now and then Dr. Hodgkin transgresses his laudable rule of fairness, notably when he sneers at 'the timid Church lying low during the years of Puritan ascendancy, from 1640 to 1660' (p. 201). This is a most unjustifiable attack upon Churchmen during a period when, in spite of deprivation and of actual persecution, they remained firm to their principles, and maintained the worship of God after the manner of their fathers at the most imminent risk. Nothing can justify the harsh treatment which Fox met with, but it must be owned that, though an honest and God-fearing, he was a rather irritating man. In this, as in other respects, he bore some sort of resemblance to John Wesley; and the story of his unwearied travels, all undertaken for what he verily believed to be God's service and the spread of the truth, is not unlike that of Wesley's incessant journeys. Of course the doctrines of the two men differ widely, though there is a superficial resemblance between their views of 'Christian perfection' as a thing attainable in this life. Wesley was a far more cultured and refined, and also a more reasonable man than Fox, and he towers above all his followers, as Fox does not tower above his. Those 'commonly called Quakers' never regarded Fox with the same absolute awe with which 'the people called Methodists' regarded Wesley. And yet, in one sense, Fox was a stronger character personally than Wesley ever was. In one respect, at any rate, we know perfectly well what he was. Some people say Wesley was a good Churchman, some that he was not, but all will agree that Fox was anti-Church to the backbone. It may be complained that Churchmen persecuted him, but it cannot be said that they mistook a friend for an enemy.

In th
be 'a
volum
The c
is con
Hort
Howe
hero t

'T
Engla
to thi
bodie

'O
expect
He, u
service

'A
most s
entere
memb
confor

'Bi
epicure
the nat

'Th
even m

Conce
of the
vices a
lacrym
know
the Ch
a naus
of that
his ord
detail
quite s
cannot
with th
display
of stro
party b
colour
partisan
John W
all, in a
but they
and cal

John Howe. By R. F. HORTON. *Leaders of Religion Series.*
(London: Methuen and Co., 1895.)

IN the earlier volumes of this series it was announced that it was to be 'a series of short biographies, free from party bias.' In the later volumes we see that the words 'free from party bias' are omitted. The omission is certainly a discreet one, so far as the present volume is concerned; for never did we read a more one-sided book. Dr. Horton rightly commends 'the large and loving spirit' of John Howe (p. 19); whether he has himself imbibed the spirit of his hero the reader may judge from the following extracts:

'The haughty supercilious temper which has been the Church of England's too frequent weapon against Nonconformists was exhibited to this gentle and refined spirit; the temper which was perfectly embodied in Clarendon and Sheldon' (p. 86).

'On the following Sunday a great crowd assembled in the town expecting to be fed with the Word. The parson was in consternation. He, unfortunate, had no Living Word for the 'hungry sheep,' only a service-book and such tame conventionalities' [the Prayer Book!] (p. 94).

'An exclusive episcopacy is, as subsequent experience has shown, the most sectarian principle, and the most productive of sects, that has ever entered to disturb the harmony of the Church. And it should be remembered that where Howe stood in the seventeenth, thoughtful Nonconformists still stand in the nineteenth century' (pp. 121-2).

'Bishops and the worldly clergy combined with the sensualists and epicureans of the court to harass and to ruin the most godly people in the nation' (p. 157).

'The vices and debaucheries of the reigning king were a scandal to even men of the world like Evelyn' (p. 156).

Conceive the pious and blameless John Evelyn described as a man of the world, who might have been expected to find no scandal in vices and debaucheries! But Evelyn was a Churchman: *hinc illæ lacrymæ!* If this is not party bias with a witness, we should like to know what is! The editor of this series is himself a clergyman of the Church of England; it must, one would have thought, have been a nauseous dose to him to swallow all this and much similar abuse of that Church whose doctrines and discipline he is surely bound by his ordination vows to defend! We do not propose to criticize in detail Dr. Horton's work; the extracts which have been given are quite sufficient to show the *animus* with which it is written. But we cannot help remarking a sad degeneracy in the later, as compared with the earlier, volumes of this series. We do not complain of the display of party bias. The scheme of writing biographies of men of strong religious convictions which should be altogether free from party bias has always seemed to us impracticable, unless a rapid, colourless portrait was all that was to be expected. But there are partisans *and* partisans. The writers of the lives of John Keble, John Wesley, William Laud, and Charles Simeon in this series were all, in a sense, party men, and showed their colours plainly enough; but they were all men—well, to put it mildly, of rather a different type and calibre from some of those to whom the later biographies have been

entrusted. Whether the change is for the better or not we need not here discuss. Suffice it to say that English Churchmen who do not desire to be exasperated by seeing their Church depreciated, not to say insulted, had better eschew the 'Leaders of Religion.'

Some Side-lights on the Oxford Movement. By MINIMA PARSPARTIS. (London and Leamington: Art and Book Company, 1895.)

THE title of this book might lead the reader to expect some fresh light upon a subject which has been treated by some of the ablest pens of the day; so we hasten to warn him against entertaining any such hope. The 'Side-lights' throw no light upon any subject whatever, least of all upon the Oxford Movement. They simply repeat the old story of a weak and excitable young lady who, in the fifties, was allured—certainly not from Tractarianism, for she does not appear to have been really brought under its influence, but from no religion in particular, to the religion of Rome. At the ripe age of twelve years she began to frequent (whether with or without the consent of her friends, who were English Churchpeople, does not appear) the then newly erected Roman church at Woodchester in Gloucestershire. There she fell under the influence of a Passionist Father, and became a Romanist at heart, though more than twenty years elapsed before she declared herself. One specimen may suffice to show the sort of argument by which she was affected:

'One of our visits to Woodchester was rather disturbing. We were a large party, and amongst the number was the incumbent of a London church, a gentleman of an argumentative turn of mind, very sure of the superiority of his position, and very anxious to improve the occasion. So in the sacristy, where we were being shown some vestments, he made some insulting observations about idolatry as practised in the Roman Church. The Italian Father, who did not possess much English, was kindly trying to put him right when in came a recent convert, who grasped the situation at once, and immediately joined in the discussion.

"I beg your pardon, sir," he said to the parson, 'but are you married?'

"Yes, I am," was the expected answer.

"Then why did you say to your wife, in the marriage ceremony, 'With my body I thee worship'? Was not that idolatry?"

'The question was aggravating, but very much to the point. . . . I had the comfort of knowing that the Anglican parson was completely worsted—that he should be ashamed of himself was too much to expect' (pp. 3, 4).

By parity of reasoning, every time we speak of 'his Worshipful the Mayor,' or address a magistrate as 'your Worship,' we virtually sanction the Roman views of image worship! But really, after this, it is quite hopeless to attempt to answer our authoress's reasoning; we must be content humbly to point out the characteristic features of her work. Perhaps the most prominent is her incessant abuse of the English clergy. 'The silencing so dear to the High Church parson,' 'women have no right to an opinion' (p. 76); 'perhaps nothing less evasive was to be expected from an Anglican clergyman' (p. 298); 'But it is such a foolish thing to be' [a priest of the Church of England]

(p.
'th
her
pro
mai
as t
soci
abb
she
to a
Mr.
so g
on a
worl
she
blas
his s
'I u
'It
hear
of re
but
than
jest
the
verg
know
comp
have
cratic
in he

ful B
acco
seem
St. D

May
Barlo
other
We l
been
diffic
the E
devel
were
the o
the C
have
numb

(p. 354); 'Mr. Baker, the semi-fatuuous old parson of her parish' (p. 355); 'the more learned Anglican divines evidently sympathize with ancient heretics' (p. 118); this is the sort of language which is scattered in profusion throughout her pages. 'The poor little Barker,' the clergyman who acted as her brother's tutor, and who was so unreasonable as to object to his pupil (aged sixteen) spending his time in general society instead of attending to his work, is the object of her special abhorrence, and many pages are devoted to her remarks on what she elegantly calls 'the barkings of Mr. Barker' (p. 364). It is fair to add that she is kind enough to pat on the back one clergyman, Mr. Woodford, afterwards Bishop of Ely, of whose preaching she is so good as to approve, though of course she thinks it is all founded on a fallacy (see p. 272, &c.) The next distinguishing feature of her work is a sublime contempt for the Anglican mode of worship, which she sometimes expresses in terms which run perilously near to blasphemy. 'He gave out the first verse of a hymn and called on his soul to awake and run its daily stage of duty with the sun' (p. 13). 'I usually went to Mass instead of to "Dearly beloved"' (p. 444). 'It was no sacrifice to me to give up our reformed Liturgy, and I heard "Dearly beloved Brethren" for the last time without a pang of regret' (p. 9). This joke about 'Dearly beloved' is not original, but she appears to think it so good that it will bear repeating more than once. A benighted Anglican may fail to catch the point of the jest; he may also have an uncomfortable feeling that it is a jest upon the actual and oft-repeated words of Holy Scripture, and therefore verges on the blasphemous. But to return to our authoress. Her knowledge of history is another striking feature of her work. All competent historians, including her own co-religionist, Dr. Lingard, have long ago given up all doubt about Archbishop Parker's consecration, but our authoress knows better; and the old doubt rises up in her pages like a phoenix from its ashes:

'Who consecrated Parker Archbishop of Canterbury? . . . The lawful Bishops would not consecrate him. To perform this ceremony an accommodating man of the name of Barlow was found. He does not seem to have been consecrated, being styled Bishop-elect of St. Asaph, St. David [*sic*], and Bath and Wells' (pp. 35, 36; see also p. 450).

May we suggest that 'the accommodating man of the name of Barlow' was not the only consecrator? There were certainly three others—Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins. But these are details. We learn again from this book that Cardinal Newman must have been quite wrong when he thought that he could only escape the difficulty of the English Church having the note of antiquity which the Roman Church had not by having recourse to the theory of development. All his elaborate arguments in favour of development were perfectly unnecessary, for 'the Roman Catholic Church . . . is the only living religion which can pretend to be a representative of the Christianity of antiquity' (p. 118). We learn, moreover, that we have been quite wrong in our method of spelling the names of a number of people and places. The rather well-known Sir James

Stephen ought to be Sir James Stephens, for so his name is spelt over and over again in these pages (pp. 60, 62, 63). The biographer of Sancroft, whom we have hitherto known as Dr. D'Oyly, must henceforth be Dr. d'Oyley—with a small 'd' and an 'e' (p. 2). The beautiful Rosenlani, which most of us have visited, must be called Rosenlani (p. 302); the Pass of the Gemmi, the Ghemmi (p. 295); St. Apollinaris is to be transmuted into the unclassical Appolinaris (p. 288), and Sienna (p. 65), not Siena, was the home of St. Catherine. 'Minima' is not only an historian and an orthographer, but a poetess: at least in describing one glorious occasion, the occasion on which she went for the last time into an Anglican church, on Ash Wednesday, just before she was admitted into the Roman Church, she finds prose inadequate to express her raptures, and bursts out into poetry—thus:

'And now Ash Wednesday came, the day
When few to church repair,
For on that day you know is read
The Commination Prayer;
And our late vicar, a kind man,
He oft has said to me,
He wished that service was well out
Of our good Liturgy.'

Perhaps poetic utterances ought not to be criticized in cold blood, or tied down to strict accuracy; otherwise we might point out that the Commination is not a prayer. Finally, 'Minima' is a moralist, and in that capacity has soared above the obsolete, old-fashioned notions suggested by the Fifth Commandment. She dwells plaintively on the 'many difficulties' which 'a young person of sixteen, acting against the wishes of all her relations in such a matter [going over to Rome], has to contend with' (p. 216). She inserts, with evident approval, the letter of a Roman Catholic priest, written in 1852 to her sister Olivia, who, like herself, was then a mere child, in which he offers to lend her books and remonstrates with her for 'the fear you have of seeing me; why, you are a captive without freedom, and yet not happy in your captivity. What intolerant masters you have!' (p. 121). It appears from a later passage (p. 130) that 'the intolerant masters' resolved themselves into one mistress, the poor children's own mother, who was tyrannical and unreasonable enough not to let the priest visit them. Now, is all this kind of thing really calculated to advance the cause of Rome in England? Would it not be wise if the Roman authorities were to put a stop to the lucubrations of so very embarrassing an advocate? It can hardly help them to have on their side a lady who has produced a book which reaches the very nadir of literary work.

Poems by Cecil Frances Alexander. Edited, with a Preface, by W. ALEXANDER, Archbishop of Armagh. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1896.)

To pass with a bound from 'Minima Parspartis' to Mrs. Alexander is really almost too abrupt a transition. It gives one a mental shock something like the physical shock which results from going from one

room
but
to t
gen
of c
to o
be a
caug
othe
whic
know
whic
well
hym
cons
Chri
is n
thou
Pref
read
biog
comp
fiden
ande
woun
taste
the l
chara
teach
strict
ment
awful
and t
ing to
streng
munic
ship s
intima
early
'Agn
loved
reflec
societ
grew
three
bound
was a
and '
Linco
grew r

room to another in a Turkish bath. Both belong to the gentler sex, but there the resemblance ends. We pass from—but our gallantry to the sex really forbids us to say what we pass *from*—we pass to gentleness, refinement, culture, Christian charity, true poetry. Many, of course, of the poems contained in this volume will be well known to our readers, and the better known they are, the better will they be appreciated; this perhaps is the reason why, as *yet*, none has caught hold of us quite as firmly as, say, 'The Burial of Moses,' and other Old Testament pieces, or as some of the exquisite hymns which have been familiar to us for years. But among the less known poems we would draw special attention to 'Peace, be still,' which appears among 'Poems on Sacred Subjects,' but which might well count as a hymn, and be introduced with advantage into our hymnals; while among the 'Poems Narrative and Imaginative,' two consecutive ones, 'Dying among the Pines,' and 'A Tale of the First Christians,' strike us as being particularly excellent; but really there is not a page in the whole volume which does not contain beautiful thoughts beautifully expressed. Not the least interesting part is the Preface, which we should strongly advise the reader not to skip, as readers are apt to skip Prefaces. It contains a most touching little biographical sketch by the pen of him who, of all men, was the most competent to make it. The writer takes the public into his confidence, and gives us the most interesting details about Mrs. Alexander's life. Every line is palpitating with the sensibility of a wounded heart, but he never once transgresses the rules of good taste; and though he is enthusiastic in his love and admiration of the lost one, he never gushes. We learn from him that the religious character of this gifted lady was 'based and moulded upon the best teaching of the original Oxford Movement' (xviii); that she was 'a strict Prayer-Book Christian of the old-fashioned kind' (xix); 'sacramental to the roots of her being, with a reverence at once sweet and awful for a great gift and a sacred mystery'; a 'Churchwoman through and through, reading Scripture and repeating the Psalms daily according to the Church's use, and attending daily service until health and strength began to fail'; and 'up to her last illness a weekly communicant' (xx). Yet with all this strong and distinctive Churchmanship she had very wide sympathies, and was not only friendly, but intimate with many who certainly did not share her views. In her early married life her most intimate friend was a Miss Agnes Jones. 'Agnes Jones was decidedly Evangelical, but these two holy souls loved each other for the sweet image of Christ which each saw reflected in the other' (xiii). 'She particularly delighted in the society of Dean Stanley, Mr. Matthew Arnold, and Mr. Lecky, and grew indignant when she heard a hard word spoken of any of the three' (xiv). Culture, of course, would be the bond of union which bound her to these very distinguished men; but when to culture was added similarity of religious views, naturally the bond was closer; and 'when she saw Bishop Wilberforce, or Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln ("Saint Christopher," as she loved to call him), her face grew radiant with pleasure' (xiv).

In conclusion, we must thank the Archbishop for having lifted the veil from the inner life of one whose writings are loved by all who have the taste to appreciate true poetry; and we can quite understand how goodness as well as genius helped to make her, as it helped to make John Keble, write as she did.

Sermons preached in the Leeds Parish Church, 1889-95. By EDWARD, BISHOP OF ROCHESTER, then Vicar of Leeds. (London: Rivington, Percival, and Co., 1896.)

THOSE who complain that modern sermons are unreal and conventional could hardly bring this charge against those of Dr. Talbot. Indeed, as people are never satisfied with sermons, we can fancy some complaining of an opposite fault. It might certainly startle some old-fashioned churchgoers to hear the preacher citing the 'Brothers Cheeryble,' in Dickens's *Nicholas Nickleby*, as instances of the attractiveness of geniality (p. 56); it might even startle them to hear 'geniality' made the subject of a sermon at all. 'Highfalutin' is an expression which we look for in a smart article rather than in a sermon (p. 75), though it is fair to add that Dr. Talbot introduces it with an apology; the same may be said of 'swaggering' (p. 71) and 'swagger' (p. 68), and of 'good form' and 'the right thing,' used in the slang sense of those terms. Nevertheless, we think that Dr. Talbot is quite right. You must speak a 'language understood of the people' if you are to touch them at all; and so long as he avoids grotesqueness, bad taste, or anything that could fairly evoke a smile in that sacred place (and the sermons before us are absolutely free from anything of the sort), the less conventional a preacher is the better. Dr. Talbot is always serious, always earnest, always thoughtful, always cultured, and sometimes really eloquent. No one, again, can utter against him another very common complaint against the modern preacher—that he gives him no original ideas. He must be, or fancy himself to be, a man of great originality and variety of thought who can find in these sermons no idea which had not occurred to him before. And yet we should hardly imagine that such sermons as these would be popular with the average congregation, especially with a town congregation of respectable Philistines. It is not that the preacher soars above their heads; on the contrary, a very simple person might perfectly well understand every word of the language, and follow every line of the argument. But Dr. Talbot seems to us to stand, as it were, on a different plane from such an audience; his thoughts would hardly be their thoughts, or his difficulties their difficulties. We could, to put it plainly, well understand the Leeds tradesman, as he came out of church, saying to his neighbour, 'What was the man driving at?' These are distinctly the sermons of a man who has not had a long parochial experience. Take, for example, the remarkable, suggestive, and original sermon on 'Praise.' We do not believe it would ever come into the head of one in a thousand among any ordinary parochial congregation to raise any of the objections which Dr. Talbot raises and satisfactorily answers; and the danger is that people might remember the objection which is

put into their heads, because it is quite a new thing to them, but forget the answer to it. Or take, again, the sermon on 'Pride,' preached by Dr. Talbot 'as chaplain at the annual parade of the Leeds Rifle Corps.' An old parish hand would have realized what are the constituent parts of a rifle corps; that is, what the men, the vast majority—not the officers, the small minority—are made of, and would have seen that the class of people against whom the Psalmist inveighs in the tenth Psalm, from which the text is taken, are quite different from that of the young fellows seated in front of him. We much doubt whether any one of them would carry away with him one single idea that would be really helpful to him in his future life. Take, once more, Dr. Talbot's answer to the question proposed by himself, 'What do you mean by the Church? Do you mean the Church of England? and, if so, what of those outside it?' (p. 8). We are quite sure that Dr. Talbot did not mean by his answer, which is too long to quote, that it made no difference whether a man went to church or chapel; but we are not at all sure whether that is not the impression which an average churchgoer would carry away with him. While, then, we heartily thank Dr. Talbot for a volume of most interesting and suggestive sermons, which we have read with the greatest pleasure and, we trust, profit, we cannot recommend them as models for the ordinary parish priest to take in providing spiritual food for his own congregation.

A

Alc

by

54

And

of

H

Ar

R

A

J.

Arg

B

au

19

19

L.

of

th

10

di

16

th

C

G

ol

Ap

vi

T

pr

ne

of

be

so

th

18

Pl

off

Ch

B^A

tid

ing

INDEX TO VOL. XLIII.

ALE

- A**LETHEA: at the Parting of the Ways (by 'Cyril'), 282
 Alexander, Cecil Frances, *Poems* by (ed. Archbishop of Armagh), 548
 Andrewes, Bishop, *The Devotions of (Grace et Latine*: ed. Rev. H. Veale), 271
 Archbishop Benson in Ireland: a Record of his Irish Sermons and Addresses, 1896 (ed. Rev. Dr. J. H. Bernard), 513
 Argyll, Duke of, *The Philosophy of Belief*, 155 sqq.: summary of the author's arguments: Intuition, 156; the necessity of Intuition, 157; philosophies of Nature: Lucretius: Fortuity, 158; origin of man and of language, 161; the author's definition of Nature, 162; Matter and Force, 164; division of man from the animals, 166; evidence of Design, 168; the author's view of God as the Creator, 172; the Intuition of God, 174; the treatment of the old schools of paganism by the Apostles, 175; the author's review of Hebrew and Christian Theology, 176; Inspiration and prophecy, 178; the 'triple witness' of St. Peter: the testimony of the Spirit, 180; 'Christian belief in its relation to Philosophy,' 181; the Philosophy of the Apostolic age: the Stoics, 182; modern philosophy, 183; Platonism, 183 sq.; the true office of philosophy towards Christianity, 184

BATHE, Rev. A., and Buckham, Rev. F. H., *The Christian's Roadbook* (Part II., Readings), 538

CLA

- Baylis, Mr. M. S., *The Churchman's History of England*, 286
 Bennett, Prof. W. H., *The Theology of the Old Testament*, 275
 Berry, Rev. T. S., *Holy Scripture*, 507
 Blakelock, Rev. C. O., *Life's Shadows*, 507
 Brooke, Rev. A. E., *The Commentary of Origen on St. John's Gospel*, 262
 Bruce, Rev. W. S., *The Ethics of the Old Testament*, 269
 Burgon, Dean, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established* (edited &c. by Ed. Miller), 238 sqq.: description of the work, 239; theory of the Dean and Mr. Miller, *ib.*; arguments: the predominance of the traditional text from the fourth century to the nineteenth, 240; the argument criticized, 241; Dr. Hort's view, 243; Mr. Miller's statistics of Patristic readings, 244; the argument that the *Textus Receptus* is intrinsically the best, 246; the Peshitto compared with the Curetonian Syriac, 247; treatment of the Old Latin and the Itala, 248; argument from the style of writing and the material of Greek MSS., 250; the argument criticized from the palæographical point of view, 251; the *provenance* of MSS. B and Σ , 252; appreciation of Mr. Miller's work, 253

CLARK, F. A., *Thomas Ken* ('Leaders of Religion' Series), 542

DAW

DAWSON, Sir J. W., *Eden Lost and Won*, 280

Democracy and Liberty (Mr. Lecky's work), 132 *sqq.*: growth of Reform in England, 132; the crowning of demos: differing views as to the results, 133; Mr. Lecky's views on the growth of taxation in Europe, 135; danger of priestly ascendancy, 136; aggressive spirit of Catholicism, 137; the Falk Laws, 138; religious intimidation in Ireland, 139; the establishment of free education, 140; history of education in France, 141; the 'proselytizing type of atheism,' 142; growth of Socialism, 143; 'Collectivists,' 145; Lassalle and Marx, 146; refutation of their fallacies, 147; growth of wealth: its effect on the working classes, 148; Socialism in the United States: Mr. Henry George's doctrines, 149; Dr. Schäffle's exposition of Socialism, 150; Socialism in France, Germany, and Belgium, 151; increase of State intervention in England, 152; Christian Socialism, 153; general estimate of Mr. Lecky's work, 154

Dolling, Rev. Robert R., *Ten Years in a Portsmouth Slum* (St. Agatha's, Landport), 536
Dublin Review, *The* (July 1896), 254

ECKENSTEIN, LINA, *Woman under Monasticism: Chapters on Saint-lore and Convent Life*, A.D. 500-1500, 278

Edwards, Rev. Dr. T. C., *The God-Man* (the 'Davies Lecture' for 1895), 508

English History, the Father of, 112 *sqq.*: opportuneness of the publication of Mr. Plummer's edition of Bede's *History*, 112; value of Bede's writings, 113; comparison of Mr. Plummer's with previous editions, 114; the MSS. of Bede, *ib.*; estimate of Mr. Plummer's work, 115; illustrations of Bede, 118; comments

EPI

on Wilfrid, 119; Eddi's Life of Wilfrid, 120; Queen Etheldreda, 121; story of St. Augustine, 122; 'St. Augustine's Oak,' 123; spelling of names in Bede, 124; old dioceses, 125; church building, 126; notes on doctrines and practices, 127; the character of Bede, 127; the Epistle to Ecgerbert, 128; Bede a model for theological students, 129; his learning, 130; his title of 'Venerable,' 131

Episcopate, the Anglican, *Types of*: Canon Simpkinson's *Life of Bishop Thorold*, 51 *sqq.*; early years of Anthony Thorold, 53; curate of Whittington, *ib.*; sermons, 54; at St. Giles's-in-the-Fields: mission work and schools, 54 *sq.*; attention to study, 55; a discipline of sorrow, 56; the contest for the first London School Board, *ib.*; Canon of York, 57; Bishop of Rochester, 58; treatment of Ritualists, 59; organization of an unwieldy diocese, 60; foundation of Diocesan Societies, 61; views of the functions of a bishop, *ib.*; summary of his labours during four years, 62; new churches built, 63; help from College Missions: Thorold's appeal to the undergraduates of Pembroke College, 64 *sq.*; estimate of the Bishops' methods, 66; translation to Winchester, 67.—Canon Rawnsley's *Life of Bishop Harvey Goodwin*, 68 *sqq.*: sketch of his early life, 68; his mother's influence, 69; first Communion, 70; early Calvinistic surroundings: his change of religious views, 71; work as curate in Cambridge, 72; influence on undergraduates, 73; appointed Dean of Ely, *ib.*; work for the cathedral, 74; Bishop of Carlisle: state of the diocesan clergy, 75; Goodwin's work as bishop, 76; Sir H. Acland's estimate of him, 77.—Comparison and contrast of the two bishops, 78

FRO

FROUDE, Professor J. A., *Lectures on the Council of Trent, delivered at Oxford, 1892-93*, 521

GIBBON, EDWARD, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (ed. Prof. J. B. Bury), 506

Gladstone, Mr., *Studies Subsidiary to the Works of Bishop Butler*, 1 sqq. : Mr. Gladstone's qualifications for his task as editor of Butler, 3 ; value of the study of Butler, 4 ; his early life, *ib.* ; ecclesiastical career, 5 ; Bishop of Durham, 6 ; popularity of the *Analogy*, 6 ; its commentators and critics, 8 ; causes which have led to Butler's high position : his method, 9 ; basis of the main point of his system, 11 ; his arguments useful for the present and for every age, 12 ; not antiquated, 13 ; use against Agnosticism : Mr. H. Spencer's position, 14 ; main points of the teleological question : the order of the Cosmos, 16 ; objections considered, 17 ; the revelation of the moral character of the Supreme Being : Butler's teaching, 18 ; how it meets the doubts of the present day, 19 ; analysis of Mr. Gladstone's *Studies*, 20 ; treatment of Butler's critics, 21 ; comparison of Butler with the ancients : the developments of human character, 22 ; especially in Christian times, 24 ; Mr. Gladstone's estimate of Butler's mental qualities, 26 ; the question of a future life, *ib.*

Gore, Rev. Canon, *The Sermon on the Mount : a Practical Exposition*, 510

Gould, Rev. Professor, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark*, 491

Gould, Rev. S. Baring, *The Golden Gate : a Manual of Church Doctrine*, 516

Guinness, Rev. Dr. H. G., *Creation centred in Christ*, 499

JON

HALL, Bishop (Vermont), *The Church's Discipline concerning Marriage and Divorce* (First Triennial Charge), 509

Hammond, Rev. Canon, *Concerning the Church : a Course of Sermons*, 515

Heurtley, Rev. Dr., *Wholesome Words : Sermons upon some important points of Christian Doctrine* (ed. Rev. W. Ince), 504

Hodgkin, Dr. T., *George Fox* ('Leaders of Religion' Series), 543

Horton, R. F., *John Howe* ('Leaders of Religion' Series), 545

Hunt, Rev. Dr. J., *Religious Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century*, 528

Hutchings, Rev. Canon, *Gleanings, Spiritual, Doctrinal, and Practical*, 512

INCARNATION, *The Doctrine of the* (review of Rev. R. L. Ottley's work), 28 sqq. : the Christology of St. Paul : treatment of the Atonement, 28 ; the evidence for the Incarnation, 30 ; the 'perfection' of Christ's Human Nature, 31 ; criticism of the author's views : on the deposit of the Faith, 32 ; his view of tradition, 33 ; the teaching of the Fathers, 34 ; apologies for heresy, 35 ; treatment of Holy Scripture : the miracles of Christ, 37 ; Old Testament prophecy, 38 ; the Second Epistle of St. Peter, and the writings of St. John, 39 ; Mr. Ottley's views on the *révélation*, 41 ; treatment of St. Athanasius and of St. Cyril of Alexandria, 44 ; of St. Leo, the Council of Chalcedon, St. John Damascene, 46 ; of Alcuin, St. Thomas Aquinas, 'Adoptionism', 47 ; general estimate of Mr. Ottley's theory of the Incarnation, 49 ; the 'Principles of Conciliar Authority', 50 ; his panegyric on Luther, 50 n.

JONES, Rev. Harry, *Fifty Years : or, Dead Leaves and Living Seeds*, 268

JUV

Juvenile Crime, and efforts to diminish the amount, 469 *sqq.*; statistics of increase of juvenile crime in England, France, and Germany, 470; increase of education and decrease of poverty have not produced the results expected, 471; crime and vice in the early part of the century, 472; reclamation work of Mr. Barwick Baker, 473; Lord Shaftesbury and Dr. Barnardo, 474; Society for providing Homes for Waifs and Strays, 476; Mr. George Müller's work, 477; Reformatories and Industrial Schools, 478; their management and results, 480; the Report of the Commission of 1895, 483; the after-life of the inmates, 484; recommendations of the Commission, 486; Day Industrial Schools, 487; Truant Schools, 488; evils arising from the lack of definite religious instruction, 489

KITTEL, Professor R., *A History of the Hebrews*, vol. i. (trans. J. Taylor), 501

LITTLE Books on Religion (ed. W. R. Nicoll), 277
Lucas, Rev. H., *The Road to Reunion*, 256

MAGEE, ARCHBISHOP, Life and Correspondence of (Dr. Macdonnell's work), 400 *sqq.*; Magee's birth and childhood, 402; young-manhood, 403; university reputation as an orator, 404; ordination: efforts to perfect his preaching power, *ib.*; state of Dublin churches, 405; Magee's love of home and friends, 406; religious views, 407; appointments in England, 408; rector of Enniskillen, *ib.*; his sarcastic letters, 409; an opponent of Irish National Education, 410; desire to return to

PAP

England, 411; appointed Bishop of Peterborough, 412; speech against Irish Disestablishment, *ib.*; opinions on the Irish revision of the Prayer Book, 413; relation to the great Church revival: dealings with Confession, 415; support of the Public Worship Regulation Act, 417; general estimate of his character, 418
Mason, Rev. Dr., *The Principles of Ecclesiastical Unity*, 256; *The Conditions of our Lord's Life on Earth*, 494
Maturin, Rev. B. W., *Some Principles and Practices of the Spiritual Life*, 273
Minor Prophets, Practical Reflections on every Verse of the (Anon.: Preface by Bishop of Lincoln), 532
Modern Reader's Bible, The (ed. Prof. R. G. Moulton), 276
Munk, Dr. W., *The Life of Sir Henry Hallford, Bart., President of the Royal College of Physicians, &c.*, 534

NÖLDEKE, Prof. Theodor, *Sketches from Eastern History* (trans. J. S. Black), 281

OXFORD Movement, *Some Side-lights on the* (by 'Minima Parspartis'), 546

PAPAL Bull on Anglican Orders, the, 365 *sqq.*: the method by which the Pope's conclusion was reached, 365; the falling back upon the Bulls and Breves of Julius III. and Paul IV., 369; history of these, 371; Cardinal Pole's interpretation of his 'Extraordinary Faculties,' 373; and of the phrase 'dummodo . . . ecclesiæ forma et intentio sit servata,' 374; Paul IV.'s ratification makes no allusion to an invalid rite, 375; criticism of Leo XIII.'s argument on the point, 376; evidence that Pole

PAP

did not *reordain* but merely rehabilitated the Edwardine clergy, 377; the decision of Clement XI.: the Gordon case, 380; Leo XIII.'s assertion that this decision rests upon 'defect of form,' 381; discussion of the grounds of the recent decision, 383; the alteration of the Ordinal in 1662, 384; the charge that the prayers are indeterminate, 387; that there is no mention of the Eucharist Sacrifice, 388; that all mention of sacrificial functions has been 'deliberately removed,' 391; that the English Ordinal, 'vitiated in its origin,' is vitiated in its effect, 394; that changes were made 'to suit the errors of the Reformers,' 395; reply to the argument from the defect of intention, 396; reasons for the Ordinal's use of such phrases as 'ministering' or 'dispensing the Sacraments,' 397; history of the Ordinal of 1550: its general acceptance by the bishops, 399

Papal Encyclical on Unity, the, 282 *sqq.*: issues involved in the Pope's letter, 290; detailed examination of its contents: the definition of the unity of the Church, 291; the methods of unity and government to be sought in the teaching of Christ, 292; the position of Bishops, 293; assertion that Christ 'appointed Peter to be the head of the Church': the 'Petrine texts,' 295; the Papal interpretation lacks the 'consent of the Fathers,' 296; the Pope's quotations from the Fathers tested by their contexts: Pacian, 297; St. Cyril of Alexandria, Origen, St. Chrysostom, 298; Pseudo-Basil, St. Ambrose, 299; the sort of primacy which the See of Rome had in the Early Church, 300; the Pope's contention with regard to the Roman Pontiffs as successors of St. Peter, *ib.*; further test of his Patristic quotations: St. Irenæus, 301; St.

PRI

Cyprian, 303; meaning of 'root and mother' of the Catholic Church, 303; St. Jerome: the 'public criterion of a Catholic,' 304; St. Augustine, 305; Maximus the Abbot, 306; statements in Councils: Ephesus, Chalcedon, Third of Constantinople, 307; relation of Chalcedon to Pope Leo the Great, 308; Hormisdas's 'formula of Catholic faith,' 309; Leo XIII.'s views of the relations of Bishops to the Pope: his quotations criticized: St. Jerome, 310; St. Chrysostom, St. Leo, St. Cyprian, 311; Optatus, 313; later Western writers, *ib.*; statement of the true Catholic doctrine as against the Papal claims, 314; discussion of the 'organic' and the 'moral' unity of the Church, 315; future reunion not despaired of 317

Plato, *The School of* (review of Mr. Bussell's work), 454 *sqq.*: general character of the book, 455; Personality in relation to Certainty, *ib.*; all certainty is built on scepticism, 457; the author's conception of the history of philosophy, *ib.*; relation between Reason and Faith, 458; Mr. Bussell's Individualism, 459; treatment of Collectivism, 460; the Atonement and altruism, 461; some 'flashy' opinions, 462; his views on the origin of philosophy, 463; the teleology of Socrates developed by Plato, 464; the Personality of God, *ib.*; Aristotelianism: its fate in the later mediæval schools, 465; Philo of Alexandria, the revival of Platonism, Platonizing Stoics, 466; Plotinus, 467; the breakdown of Neoplatonism, 468

Pritchard, Professor, *Memoirs of* (review of the *Life* by his daughter, Ada Pritchard), 439 *sqq.*; likeness of Professor Pritchard to Dr. Johnson, 439; his school and university life, 441; work as a schoolmaster, 443; views on deterrent punishment, 444; his family life, 445; intercourse with

PUL

- Tennyson, 445; religious and scientific work, 446; Bishop Perowne's estimate of him, 448; his religious views, 449; his mathematical studies, 450; astronomical work, 451; Savilian Professor of Astronomy, 452; the *Uranometria nova Oxoniensis*, and determination of stellar parallax by photography, 453; eulogies of his science and of his character, 454
- Pullan, Rev. Leighton, *Lectures on Religion*, 260

ROSSETTI, CHRISTINA,
New Poems by, hitherto unpublished or uncollected (ed. W. M. Rossetti), 537

Russia and the English Church during the last Fifty Years (correspondence between Mr. William Palmer and M. Khomiakoff, 1844-54: ed. W. J. Birkbeck), 517

S. AURELII AUGUSTINI
Hippionensis Episcopi Liber de Catechizandis Rudibus (ed. W. Yorke Fausset), 524

St. Catherine of Siena, 344 *sqq.*; Dean Milman's treatment of her, 344; works by Mr. Algar Thorold, Mrs. Drane, and Mrs. Butler on the Saint, 346; her life in childhood, 347; her ecstasies and visions, 349; Italian life in her day, *ib.*; her private life: growth of her influence, 350; Friar Bartholomew's description of her, 351; labours during the plague, 352; contemplative life: the *Dialogue*, 353; its treatment of the Love of our Neighbour, 354; of Prayer, 358; denunciation of the sinful lives of the clergy, 360; her more public life: embassy to Avignon, 362; influence during the political troubles of the period, 363; her death, 364

Sanctuary and Sacrifice (Dr. Baxter's reply to Wellhausen), 186

SEL

sqq.: statement of Wellhausen's position, 186; his method, 188; Dr. Baxter's method: the historicity of the Temple shown from the books from which Wellhausen educes his theory, 189; the existence of the 'high places,' 191; historicity of the Tabernacle, 192; Wellhausen's method of settling a dilemma, 193; testimony of the Books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, 194; of Chronicles, 196; Wellhausen's dating of the three Codes: the first (Exod. xx. 22-xxiii. 33), 197; the Deuteronomic and the Priestly Codes, 198; Wellhausen's views on Sacrifice, 199; the sacrificial ritual, 201; teaching of the more strictly historical books, 203; of the prophets, 204; exegesis of Isa. i. 10, 20, and Jer. vii. 21-23, 205; Ezekiel and the Post-Exilic prophets, 206; Wellhausen's notion of the origin and evolution of sacrifice, 209; and of the materials of sacrifice, 210; the use of incense, 211; the relative positions of burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, 213; exposure of Wellhausen's self-contradictions, 214; his views on sin and trespass offerings, 214; general estimate of Dr. Baxter's work, 215

Sayce, Rev. Professor, *Patriarchal Palestine*, 264

Schechter, Mr. S., *Studies in Judaism*, 500

Selborne, Lord (review of his *Memorials*), 317 *sqq.*: sketch of his father's home-life and character as a clergyman, 319 *sqq.*; the eldest son, William Palmer, 322; Roundell Palmer's school-days, 323; love of Winchester, 324; his headmaster and school-fellows, 325; at Oxford, 326; study of law, 327; called to the Bar, 328; devotion to study, 329; literary work, 330; growth of religious convictions, 333; entry into parliamentary life, 334; his action in the case of Dr. Hampden, 335; admission of Jews to

SHA

- Parliament, 336; marriage with a deceased wife's sister, 'Papal aggression,' 337; University Reform, opening national institutions on Sunday, 338; the Crimean war, the second Chinese war, 339; action as Solicitor-General and afterwards Attorney-General, 340; his friendships, *ib.*; opinions on the Irish Church and on Church establishments, 342
- Shaw, Rev. W. F., *Sermon Sketches for the Christian Year*, 266
- Sinclair, Ven. Archdeacon, *Leaders of Thought in the English Church*, 539
- Smalley, Mr. G. W., *Studies of Men*, 531
- Strong, Rev. T. B., *Christian Ethics* (Bampton Lectures, 1895), 216 *sqq.*: form of the work, 216; special character of Christian ethics presented, 217; Greek treatment of morals: the ideal man, 218; the combination of Greek thought with Hebrew faith, 219; Christian morality is based on the Incarnation, 220; the moral atmosphere of the Gospels, 221; the work of Greek genius in the Christian Church: not in the field of ethics, 223; human feeling an impulse towards faith, 224; Professor Sidgwick's comparison of the ethic of the Church and that of the philosophers, 225; why heathen writers ignored Christianity, 227; origin of treatises on Moral Theology, 228; the decisive test of the value of any ethical system, 230; the metaphysical difficulties respecting free will, 231; connexion of morality and reason: Mr. Strong's views of Scholastic philosophy, 233; the omission of untruthfulness from its list of vices, 234; how far ethical principles influenced the Reformers, 235; the supposed connexion of Discipline and Casuistry, 236; present day needs of the Church, 237
- Stubbs, Bishop (Oxford), *A Charge*,

UNI

- delivered at his Third Visitation, May and June, 1896*, 283
- Supernatural, The: a Rational View of the Divine Word and of the Dual Nature of Man* (by 'Katholikos'), 514
- TALBOT, Bishop (Rochester), *Sermons preached in the Leeds Parish Church*, 550
- Thackeray, F. St. John, *Memoir of Dr. Hawtrey*, 541
- Theism, *Philosophy of* (Dr. A. C. Fraser's Gifford Lectures for 1894-95), 419 *sqq.*: value of works on natural theology, 419; changed conditions of its treatment, 421; relation of Dr. Fraser's work with the object of Lord Gifford's foundation, 422; consideration of hypotheses for the seat of the Reason that orders the Cosmos: Universal Materialism, 423; its failure in regard both to the material world and the problem of morality, 425; Panegoism: wrecked on the rock of conscience, 427; Pantheism: fails by its exclusion of morality, 429; the solution offered by Theism, 430; the nature of Reason, *ib.*; the function of the logical faculty, 431; necessity of faith before we can consider the universe at all, 433; real meaning of a First Cause, 435; St. Paul's definition of the province of natural theology, 436; moral consciousness is a fortress of Theism, 438
- Townsend, Rev. Dr. J. H., *Edward Hoare, M.A.: a Record of his Life based upon a brief Autobiography*, 503
- UNIVERSITIES of Europe in the Middle Ages (review of Mr. Rashdall's work), 80 *sqq.*: origin of the book, 80; original meaning of 'University,' 82; a *Studium* or *Studium Generale*, 83; the source of the *jus ubique docendi*, 84; Paris and Bologna

UNI

the archetypal Universities, 84 ; influence of Alcuin, 85 ; Charles the Great's Palace School, 86 ; Renaissance of the twelfth century, *ib.* ; Berengar of Tours, 87 ; study of logic, *ib.* ; influence of Abailard, 88 ; the School of Salerno : women doctors, 89 ; the study of Roman law, 90 ; Canon Law, 91 ; foreign guilds or Universities at Bologna, 92 ; source of the *licentia docendi*, 93 ; election of officers by students, *ib.* ; the developed constitution of Bologna, 94 ; Paris : Master of the Schools, *Primerius*, 95 ; organized body of Masters : the custom of Inception, 96 ; history of the University of Paris, 97 ; the control of the Chancellor, *ib.* ; the four Nations, 98 ; origin of the Rector, *ib.* ; the conflict with Mendicant Friars sowed the seeds of Gallicanism, 99 ; formation of 'Colleges,' 101 ; smaller Italian Universities : Padua, Florence, Pisa, Naples, 102 ;

WHY

University of the Roman Court, 103 ; Spanish Universities, *ib.* ; lesser Universities of France, 104 ; German Universities, 106 ; English Universities : the *Origines* of Oxford, 106 ; its Chancellor, 108 ; secessions arising from disputes between Town and University, 109 ; the Wycliffite movement in the University, 110

WAKEMAN, H. O., *An Introduction to the History of the Church of England from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, 525

Watson, Rev. Dr. J., *The Mind of the Master*, 274

Wells Office Book, *The : Prime and Hours with other Services for the Use of Wells Theological College*, 522

Whetton, Rev. A. B. W., *Doctrine and Duty* (Sermons), 267

Whyte, Rev. A., *Lancelot Andrewes, and his Private Devotions*, 271

an Court,
ities, *ib.* ;
f France,
ities, 106 ;
the *Ori-*
its Chan-
as arising
Town and
Wycliffite
niversity,

An Intro-
History of
from the
Present

the Mind of

: *Prime*
Services
theological

Doctrine
67
ancelot *An-*
ate *Devo-*